







L E T T E R  
ON THE  
MEETING AT THE CROWN AND ANCHOR  
TAVERN,

ON THE FOURTEENTH OF JULY, 1791,

FOR THE PURPOSE OF CELEBRATING

THE ANNIVERSARY OF  
THE REVOLUTION IN FRANCE.

ADDRESSED TO THE

PATRONS AND STEWARDS OF THAT MEETING,

BY THE

Rev. RICE HUGHES, A. M.

OF AIDENHAM, HERTS.

DOMESTIC CHAPLAIN TO THE RIGHT HON. THE  
1<sup>ST</sup> DUKE OF RICHMOND.

P O S T S C R I P T,

ON THE ADDRESS AND DECLARATION, DELIVERED BY  
AN ADJOURNED MEETING, AT THE TRAILLED-  
HOUSE TAVERN, AUGUST 27, 1791,  
SIGNED, J. G. TOOKER, CHAIRMAN.

*Id est, deorum Angliæ Libertas est, non Senatus, non Magistratus,  
non Lex, non Mores Majorum, non Insuperata Patrum auctoritas.*

L O N D O N :

PRINTED BY W. WOODHALL,

AND SOLD BY J. STOCKDALE, PICCADILLY.

Price One Shilling and Six-pence.





---

## ADVERTISEMENT.

*THE following Letter and Postscript will best explain their object and tendency; and, therefore, the Author submits them, without any previous comment, to the judgment of his readers. The former was first sent to the Printer of the Diary, and intended for publication in that paper, on the day of the Anniversary; but owing to its length, it was necessarily reduced into detached portions, which were successively inserted. Since its publication in that form, several friends of the author, zealous for the government, and attached to the constitution of this country, advised him to collect the divided passages, and present them to the people in the following shape, conceiving that the principles it supports, and the doctrines it inculcates, might render it useful at this critical period, when certain restless spirits are endeavouring, with malicious industry, to undermine the established foundations of legitimate society, and substitute a wild spirit of popular enthusiasm, as well as impracticable theories of political equality.*

---

*V E R R A T A.*

*Page 11, line 4 from the bottom for general revelation,  
read genuine revelation.*

*Page 18, line 5 from the bottom, for uniformity, read  
conformity.*

*Page 24, line 12, for reputable, read respectable.*

*Page 43, line 13 and 14, instead of becomes, read become.*

*Page 44, line 7, read a desperate faction.*

---

---

---

L E T T E R  
TO THE  
STEWARDS AND PATRONS  
OF THE  
ANNIVERSARY OF THE REVOLUTION  
IN FRANCE, &c.

GENTLEMEN,

LIVING as I do in a situation remote from public life, and neither having had, nor wishing to have any communication with your Society, great was my surprize at the receipt of a printed letter, by the post, bearing the stamp of your authority, to invite me to join the *friends of liberty*,  
B in

in London, to celebrate an event in France, in which we had no concern, unless it is that of painful sympathy; an event, whose prominent features are those of anarchy, cruelty, injustice, and the most violent paroxysm of popular frenzy and infatuation that ever afflicted a body politic; an event too, fraught with the most direful and disastrous consequences.\*

The emancipation of a people from tyranny and despotism, under prudent and salutary restrictions, must, indeed, be a subject of gratulation and joy to every generous Briton: But tyranny and despotism have not ceased their operation in France. That arbitrary power, lately in the hands of a humane individual, who had, *during his imprisonment*, forgotten his own misfortunes in the contemplation of those of his subjects, and had evinced the greatest tenderness for their happiness; that despotic power, which he inherited from his ancestors, is usurped by a legion of tyrants. The  
last

last state of that devoted nation must be worse, than the first.

The Revolution in France, then, cannot be a subject of *present* exultation. In the annals of nations, there never has occurred an event, portentous of greater calamities and bloodshed.

Can it be supposed that a Prince so powerfully allied, yet treated with ferocious indignity; that Peers degraded from their hereditary rights; that a Clergy plundered of their revenues; will submit, unresistingly, to the levelling hand of rebellion, violence, sacrilege, and injustice.

The alienation of the revenues of religious establishments, which have a sanction of right from the authority of God, and the most ancient usages—revenues that have proceeded from the commendable munificence of pious individuals; their alienation, I say, is the greatest possible outrage and encroachment on the boasted rights of men and Christians, and must terminate in the

subversion of order and decency; nay, of the very existence of religion, the foundation of all government.

Twenty-five millions of people in a state of anarchy; a royal family imprisoned, and insulted, awaiting in dread suspense the *patristic ministers of death*! Britons! Is this a subject of exultation? It can be an object of delight only to unfeeling barbarians!

The printed letter I allude to is pregnant with deep design, perfidy, and danger. I spurned the seditious summons with that indignation it deserved.

I am aware of the disadvantages arising to a man in private life from interfering in the discussion of public topics. Offence must be supposed, where none is intended.

At a juncture like the present, however, the mirror of faction must be held up to the public eye, that its deformity may be discerned, and its views frustrated.

The political horizon of this country wears a gloomy aspect, its elements are in a state of fermentation. It behoves every friend to his King and country, to sound the alarm of danger from the impending storm, that they may guard against its consequence.

It is suggested, that your Society is hostile to our happy Constitution.—I have no doubt on the subject.

Many absurd principles concerning Government have of late been disseminated with unusual industry *from a certain source*. Every engine is in motion, every machination employed to instil groundless fears and jealousies into the people, to unsettle the minds of the credulous and ignorant, to disturb the public peace, and to overwhelm the established system of Government in confusion and disorder. The most licentious paragraphs issue forth from certain abandoned and republican prints, to fan the embers of civil discord, and qualified in terms of sedition. Turbulent  
and



and impatient of controul—jealous of rivals, and affecting the honourable love of liberty, you form confederacies to strengthen your interest, to augment your numbers.

Your language is,—“ Come cast in thy lot among us, let us have one purse; we shall find all precious substance; we shall adorn our houses with spoil.” Of the *Clergy* and *those in power*, you seem to say, “ *these* are the *beirs*; come let us kill them and seize on their inheritance.” Such is the manifest object and tendency of your intrigues, persuasions, and cabals.

I would not be understood to speak to the prejudice of the opposition in general. There are men among them of talents and integrity, of public virtue, and elevated rank. Right sorry am I to say, however, that dissingenuous artifices, the result of envy and disappointment, proceed from the party, and, too palpable not to be discerned, are used to sully the popularity of an adminis-

administration, which, in my humble opinion, have a strong claim on the gratitude of their countrymen.

I trust, that, however envy may fret, faction storm, and malice accuse, they will have support and fortitude sufficient to promote the good of the public, preserve its tranquillity, secure the prosperity of the Church, and maintain a rational system of civil and religious liberty.

To speak plain, I can consider your Society in no other light than as agents of a *disappointed faction*, of the *subtlety of the Dissenters*, and of *Gallic policy* and *finess*.

You want to impress the body of the public with the opinion, that to remove particular individuals from the public administration, and to re-place them with *your friends*, would be a certain measure to ensure the most essential national advantages; forgetting, that those who *now* complain of the exorbitant power of administration, when

*in*

*in office* not only experience, but sanction the absolute necessity of influence to give effect to the essential measures of Government.

Montesquieu is of opinion, that *frictions* are necessary to a free Government. In order to judge of their utility or danger, we should ascertain their object. I scruple not to own, if they proceed from freedom of opinion, and aim at the public welfare, they are salutary—and I am equally bold to say, if their source is selfish interest—(Is it not *now* so?) they are dangerous and destructive.

The loudest advocates for liberty in theory, are the greatest tyrants in practice. That which constitutes a patriot in a *subject*, in a *King* creates a *tyrant*.

I appeal to experience in our own country.

The wretched state of anarchy to which this nation was reduced at the period of Cromwellian usurpation, should be a warning to all querulous innovators, and to the community at large.

Did

Did *civil* and *religious* liberty prevail on the abolition of monarchy and episcopal government? Was there a greater liberty of conscience? No! National citizens were oppressed. The *superior sect* condemned the toleration not merely of the *national* church, but even of its *fellow sectaries* as unchristian.

————— *En q̄uo discórdia cives*  
*Perduxit míseros.*

At a juncture when the public tranquillity is attempted to be disturbed, private considerations should be sacrificed to the public weal, and Clergy as well as Laity, being alike citizens of the state, should dare to speak the language of loyalty, and unite their endeavours to preserve the national peace.

I have been bold to say, that your Society were dupes to a turbulent and ambitious faction; to the subtlety of an heterogeneous body of discontented and aspiring separatists, to Gallic perfidy and finesse.

The transactions of a *dark* period in the political occurrences of this country, will impress an indelible memorial, replete with horror and detestation, on the minds of Englishmen to the latest posterity.

It is here to be observed, that these nefarious and diabolical transactions originated, from the wily machinations of *spurious* patriotism. The leading actors in this tragic scene professed a wonderful zeal for religion and liberty! but their *patriotism* was *ambition*, and their *godliness*—*gain*! The confederated sons of Belial—parricides and relentless oppressors, while they assassinated the King, murdered the constitution.

The *manager* upon this bloody theatre (the principles of whose adherents were congenial with his own) in his proud passion for the *Lord's cause* (what impious and execrable hypocrisy!) was not unmindful of his *own*, but usurped a power more arbitrary and tyrannical, than a British Monarch ever possessed.

O Liberty!

•O Liberty ! Goddess of Englishmen's adoration ! how art thou abused and prostituted to the vilest purposes ! The sanction of thy sacred name is applied to principles and measures fraught with thy own destruction, tending to deprive thee of thy ancient inheritance, and to banish thee from thy favourite land !

And Religion, too ! that angel of peace and good-will among men, is perverted, and rendered an unseemly cause of strife and contention, of anarchy and disorder,

If we trace rebellion from the grand author and parent of it (*viz. the Devil*) to the little sectaries and republicans of our own time, we shall find that all mutinies, insurrections, conspiracies and disturbances, have generally proceeded from erroneous and distorted notions in religion.

Where general revelation (retained and professed with peculiar purity in the Church of England, whose articles of faith are approved by the generality

of Dissenters) where revelation, I say, has not been perverted by designing and politic men, the nation has been *united*, and our Sovereigns made happy, by the untainted loyalty and obedience of their subjects.

False notions of religion and liberty inspire the most atrocious actions. A despotic monarch is to be deprecated by every friend of liberty; but from tumultuous freedom, good Providence deliver us!

In a free government there must, of necessity, be opposite and contending parties. Power and lucrative employments are objects of solicitude and strife. Places are not so numerous as claimants. From disappointed and unsatisfied avarice and ambition, the spirit of a selfish faction grows impatient. Political uproar begins. Every artifice is employed to obstruct ministerial measures, and to distress government.

We have heard of a desperado, that, from misguided zeal, meditated the extirpation,

usurpation of King, Lords, and Commons, in a summary way, at the risk of his own personal safety. There *may* be *those*, who, from competition and envy, would compass the destruction of their country, though they suffered in the general wreck. But *their* measures must be progressive and more subtle, and wear the appearance at least of popular tendency.

Hence a faction must conciliate the attachment of those who have every thing to gain, but nothing to lose. The French Revolution seems to be an event propitious to their views; it yields a plausible pretence for a *new* arrangement of things. As if that fickle and volatile nation were infallible.

The doctrine that brings their superiors down to their own level, in rank and circumstances, will be greedily embraced by those who have neither merit to raise them into elevated stations and public confidence, or diligence to attain conveniencies and importance



from the acquisitions of industry; nor yet even prudence and œconomy to preserve that property which they inherit from their ancestors.

There is another description of men whose circumstances may not be so desperate, but who, notwithstanding, would avail themselves of an opportunity to *force* their way into power and emolument in Church and State; men excluded from confidential situations, from woeful experience of their avowed hostility to government.

But the zealous advocates for *perfect* religious liberty attack us with this triumphant question:—What has Government to do with men's religion? I reply by proposing another question—Do not certain religious opinions influence political conduct, and militate against government? Beyond a doubt! There are men among the Dissenters, who possess so much moderation and wisdom, as to wish no alteration in the present system of government, who admit the necessity

necessity of a national religious establishment to preserve purity and uniformity in religion; to promote due subordination, the essence of society; to enjoin obedience to legal governors as a moral duty, and in conformity to the example of Our Saviour, and the worthies who bore his sacred commission. They acknowledge that the members of the Church of England are the only friends to universal toleration, who make no discrimination of sects in the line of business, who are as ready to encourage an honest Dissenter as any of their own profession. Examine the large catalogue of sectaries, and point out one so superior to narrow prejudice.

The vehemence of opposition from the Dissenters to extend toleration to Papists, recoils upon themselves. The tenets of both persuasions are alike repugnant to the principles of government. Those restrictions, the cause of such heavy complaints, their tumultuous excesses have provoked; restraints  
that

that are not merely salutary, but of eternal and indispensable necessity for the safety of our excellent constitution.

Let us observe a few characteristic traits in our modern Reformers. The first champion in rank and talents for an indiscriminate religious liberty, some people are ready to say, has no predilection for any mode of worship in particular. This is, however, no man's concern but his own. I have long been in the habit of contemplating this political phenomenon with veneration and astonishment. His conduct, however, on the late attempt to repeal the Test Acts, and his repeated declaration, that "the French Revolution was one of the most glorious fabricks ever raised by human integrity," excites in me jealousy and fear. And if the sentence above quoted really proceeded from his own lips, I humbly conceive it to be an exception to his usual correctness as an orator. This glorious Revolution is execrable rebellion; and the fabrick, a  
vision;

vision; or resembling, rather, the Tower of Babel; and the National Assembly, like its artificers, characterised by chaos and confusion, violence and disorder.

With regard to the next champion, as he is now no more, I shall content myself with saying, that his principles are still living, and his adherents numerous. It is well known how they are affected towards our civil and religious policy.

The last and not the *least* in the list of Reformers, makes a great noise in the cause of turbulent patriotism. This demagogue strikes at the very root of Christianity, as well as our happy constitution. The man that is bold enough to deny the Godhead of our Saviour, and to hurl the King of Kings from the throne of the universe, may be presumed to entertain few scruples respecting the rights of an earthly monarch, his vicegerent.

Shall

Shall we, O my countrymen! consign the liberty of our consciences and of our civil rights, to the disposal and protection of such men?

Should I, upon this important subject, recite to you the conduct of our Saviour, of the Prophets, of the Apostles, of the primitive Christians, and Martyrs, I must ransack the Bible, and transcribe a great part of antiquity. The uniform tenor of their conduct was obedience, submission, and fidelity, to their respective governments.

The example of the Son of God should be particularly exhibited for our imitation. *He* was humble and respectful towards his superiors in civil rank; a good subject to the Roman Emperor, though a tyrant, to whose authority he paid all due deference, uniformity and submission. *He* never disturbed the state by factions and seditions, and even wrought a miracle to enable him to give tribute to whom tribute was due.

Blush,

Blush, and be confounded, ye that profess his name; but act in contradiction to his precepts and example ! .

The more religious men are, the greater advocates they will prove for government. This is also exemplified in miriads of the best and wisest of our ancestors. In all ages of the world, those who have been eminent for their piety, have been eminent for their loyalty; the same principle that exacts their obedience to the King of Heaven, determines their subjection to his vicergerent on earth.

I contend, in defiance of all the arguments of our adversaries, that there is an *essential* reciprocity of dependence between church and state. Without obedience and submission, no government can subsist. Religion enjoins obedience and submission to civil power, as a moral duty, with the awful sanction of future rewards and punishments; religion, therefore, must be the only durable foundation of all civil government.

Hence Princes are said to be its nursing fathers, and it becomes their interest as well as duty to establish and maintain a church whose doctrines are pure, whose rites correspond with the solemnity of divine worship, and whose ministers are trained, by a long series of laborious studies, for the proper discharge of its sacred functions.

There is a striking analogy between the natural body and body politic. The ecclesiastical or spiritual part of the constitution is its *soul*; *their* violent separation as certainly infers the dissolution of our government, as the disjunction of soul and body terminates natural life.

The two interests of our religious and civil polity are to the state, what the elements of fire and water are to the body, which united, compose; separated, destroy it. Let us then beware of political quacks, who promise a *sovereign* cure of our maladies, but *destroy our constitution*.

What

What the voice of experience and the sound policy of our ancestors have joined together, let no man put asunder. But it is said, that the object of your meeting is to abolish the alliance between these two friends. An enemy divided, becomes less formidable! *How far* your views extend, it is difficult to divine; perhaps, it may not be known to yourselves. It is my opinion, that the generality of you are less principals, than puppets set in motion by an *invisible* power.

Some are ready to think that your association originated, and is encouraged, on the other side of the channel. Is it possible that Englishmen can join in the measures of our natural enemies, to set us upon cutting each other's throat?

Frenchmen stimulated the Americans to rebellion, and effected their separation from their parent country for ever.

It has ever been the diabolical and treacherous policy of our eternal enemies to weaken a rival kingdom, by pre-



promoting its internal dissensions ; and notwithstanding *Gallic faith* and perfidy are so notorious as to become proverbial, we greedily catch at every lure they throw out to us, and resemble the lamb described by the poet (not so much in innocence, as in want of foresight) “ That licks the hand just raised to shed its blood.” Our history has recorded a fact, not inapposite to the present times, and which we should always bear in mind.

In the rebellion against the Royal Martyr, it is an incontrovertible truth, that the Dissenters and Cardinal Richelieu of France, were always intriguing; both desired a civil war; the one to depress the great, and seize on the inheritance of the church; the other, to humble the kingdom.

*Felicitas sapit, qui alieno periculo sapit.*

PLAUT.

Attend, O my countrymen! to the object and tendency of this day's celebrity.

But

But before I proceed, let us point a wistful glance at the envied fabric—the Constitution of England. In the contemplation of the harmony and symmetry of all its parts; my mind is filled with awe, reverence, and admiration. My heart glows with enthusiasm. Let me then, Gentlemen, *rather exult* in the *glorious birth-right* of a Briton, upon the basis of wise laws and good order.

This is an elevated subject for discussion, but the limits of a letter, which are already exceeded, will not admit of it. Monarchy, as it exists in England, is the first and most perfect of all governments. It is the *image* of the divine supremacy. The constitution of this country is also the *most finished* and accurate *system of liberty*, *compatible* with government. • The kingly power, not only bounded by just and equitable laws, but distinguished by a willing clemency and justice. The Sovereign, for *genuine* patriotism, for piety, for every virtue, public and private, social  
and

and domestic, as a Prince, and as a Christian, is equalled by few, excelled by none upon the face of the globe. Such an amiable character must surely endear him to our affections, consecrate him to our veneration, and challenge our loyalty and allegiance. Abandoned by men, be the faction that will disturb the peace and tranquillity of such a prince !

The people, also, by their representatives in Parliament, form a reputable and important branch of the legislature, by which they acquire a consequence, nay, a majesty in the state, which secures to them protection and reverence !

The nobility constitute the other branch of the legislature, with distinct privileges and powers. These privileges being always obnoxious to popular envy, of course in a free state are always in danger. Considerable power must be necessary for their preservation, and essentially requisite for the safety of the Constitution. The nobility having  
views

views and interests dissimilar to those of the Commons, they operate as mutual checks upon each other. Hence, the aristocratic branch of the system moderates the influence of prerogative, and restrains the encroaching enterprizes of the people.

A critical period may not be far distant, when Englishmen will esteem and revere the illustrious peerage of the realm, as the guardians of its Constitution.

(In France, *you* think they have ordered things better. What a *glorious* cause of exultation must the subject of your meeting be to our English Nobility!)

Our political existence demands that the respective constitutional powers of the three states should be poised in the nicest equilibrium; for if the balance of power preponderates in either scale, the fabric falls and perishes.

The general object of a mixed government is the same, to avoid on the

one hand tyranny, and on the other anarchy.

To form a proper estimate of the present political situation of Government, we must consider the comparative strength and weakness of the several parts of which our system is composed.

That our country is in a state of declension from the zenith of its domestic happiness and glory, I fear, cannot be denied.

It is my humble opinion, however, that the cause does not proceed from *Prerogative*, or from *Mis-administration*, which, I believe, on the contrary to be meritorious ; nor is any danger to be apprehended from that quarter ; nor yet from the late extension of the Peerage, which the circumstances of the times made essentially necessary ; and the measure reflects a lustre on the sound policy of the Minister.

Every candid and impartial man must allow, notwithstanding it has been lately asserted that the influence of  
the

the Crown had increased, was increasing, and ought to be diminished, that Government, by progressive steps, has been strongly drawn towards democracy. The danger, then, is to be expected from the misapplication of those abused and indefinite terms, "Liberty," and the "People."

The question is not what right we have to liberty, but what degree of it is compatible with our political welfare? It is the wildest and most extravagant absurdity to reason from supposed natural rights. The natural state of man is by no means a state of independance, but that of subordination. Man is obliged to submit to the constitution and laws of that country in which he resides, and is justly hanged, for refractoriness and disobedience.

What preposterous absurdities arise from reasoning from speculative principles, as is the case in France, without attending to practicability and experience. It is the united voice of reason

and of experience, that liberty in excess accomplishes its own destruction.

An excess of liberty, or in other words, an excess of popular power, produces anarchy, and must ever be the bane of such a Government as our's. The Roman constitution perished under the *usurpation* of the people. The extension of democratic power may produce, *if not timely prevented*, a similar dissolution in Britain; but, be it observed, not from any corruption of the legislative body, but from the general corruption of the people.

Seeing then that the balance of power preponderates in the popular scale; seeing that private and public solicitations are urged with unremitting industry; and inflammatory pamphlets, paragraphs, and speeches, are obtruded upon the public with more than Jesuitical zeal and artifice, to gain converts to the cause of delusive patriotism; seeing that a body of citizens dare assemble in the very heart of the metropolis, to  
celebrate

celebrate what they insidiously call a Glorious Revolution, a Revolution whose *glorious* circumstances are those of having exterminated monarchy; of having deprived the Nobility of their *birth-rights*; of having, with impious sacrilege, plundered and impoverished the Clergy, who have as inalienable a right to their respective portions of the patrimony of the Church, as any individual of the National Assembly, that has any, to his private property.

What are we to infer, then, from the avowed designs of a certain Society? Whether they assemble by sound of trumpet, or by the circulation of printed letters; whether in St. George's Fields, or at the Crown and Anchor; in the latter indeed, the fumes of wine may incite greater tumults; otherwise, I can see no difference!—What are we to conclude from their design? Will it, but that the Parliament of England might become a National Assembly; that kingly power might be reduced to  
a non-



a non-entity; and the sacred person of Majesty, perhaps imprisoned, vilified; insulted, and abused; that the patrimony of the church might become the patrimony of "the people?" that there might be an indiscriminate access to places of profit and public confidence, regardless of *requisite qualifications*; that the most obscure mechanics in Spital-Fields, or the parlious of St. Giles's, might hold an equal rank with the most elevated characters in Christendom; in short, that all external distinctions be abrogated, all subordination cease, and anarchy and confusion reign triumphant!

Such a levelling scheme would dry up the source of emulation. Ignorance and sloth would supersede genius and industry. The reign of monarchy, of science, and of literature, would be ingulphed together in so *glorious* a Revolution.

Away

Away with such an extravagant sup-  
 position. While parental affection and  
 regard for the happiness and comfort of  
 their descendants glow in British hearts;  
 while relatives wish to transmit to rela-  
 tives the fruits of their industry, and  
 the honours which the gratitude of their  
 country has conferred upon them for  
 eminent public services; while the love  
 of property, order, and liberty, is not  
 extinct among us; and reason is not ab-  
 sorbed in madness and stupidity; the  
 stability of the inimitable fabric of our  
 constitution will resemble the rocky  
 barriers of our shores, against which  
 the billows of faction may storm and  
 roar, but, like the boisterous element  
 under our cliffs, must retreat murmuring  
 from the fruitless conflict.

British ground has already been too  
 much steeped with British blood. Po-  
 licy and true wisdom will guard against  
 even possible events of danger and san-  
 guinary strife.

There is a certain sympathy in the human system, which, actuated by congeniality of sentiment, disposes the passions to be excited to a dangerous degree of fury, which, like the homogeneous nature of combustible ingredients, a spark will kindle, and the *explosion* will be proportionate to their respective accumulation.

Disloyalty is ever timid in its beginning. From lenity and connivance it grows bold and gathers progressive strength. Hence the necessity of precaution to discountenance and repress tumultuous associations at their commencement. If checked in time, they shrink like self-convicted criminals, before the resolute arm of justice, and ignobly sink into oblivion.

I beg leave, with the greatest deference, to lay before the public only a few remarks more: for to *them* the tenor of this letter is particularly addressed.

A levelling

A levelling principle, which would seem to be the principle of the times, has a wonderful influence upon the passions of the people. Its tendency is to incite them to GLORIOUS enterprises.

When they are told, that men are born *free* and *equal*; and yet they themselves are oppressed with poverty, and condemned to labour, while they behold their superiors enjoy ease, and all the pomps and luxuries of life; when they are told that all government is derived from the people (which by the bye is a problematical position) and that “the people” have a right to redress the supposed grievances in Church and State; as well as those which in their chimerical notions result from the usurped superiority in rank and affluence, and the slavishness of subordination; little persuasion will suffice to rouse them to the attempt of *restoring* the *invaded rights* of man by *violence* and *injustice*, by *rapine* and *bloodshed*.

But whom do our modern demagogues distinguish by the term—"the people?" Not the hereditary Peers of the realm; they are creatures of the Crown: Not the representatives of this very people in parliament; for they barter their constituents: Not the pastors of the Church; they monopolize the loaves and fishes: Neither the magistrates, who are the guardians of the public safety; nor yet the possessors of landed property, the opulent stockholder, nor the wealthy merchant:—They are, forsooth, tools of power; because they have a *stake* in the country and wish to preserve it.

Who then are to be our Solons and Lycurguses? Who?—The reformers of the state—lovers of their country—patriot! A *London Mob!* consisting of free-booters and assassins, that in myriads infest the metropolis, and assemble on public occasions in the cause of Liberty—to plunder! These are the men that determine the popular estimation  
of

of statesmen, and whose voice is the supposed echo of the collective voice of the community at large.

The defenders of our liberties are to be those who only regard the liberty of depredation.—The protectors of our properties—those—who have none of their own to defend, but whose object is to gain as much as they can from the general wreck.

We have long been free and unmolested in our legal rights and immunities, without invasion, without infringement.

I would not forbode evil to my country. I am confident, in the words of a real and distinguished patriot, and an honour to human nature, that *the body is sound*, “though some of its members are *infected*.”

I have observed that an increase of power is thrown into the popular scale. Unless public virtue and the friends of the constitution interfere to control the efforts of an aspiring faction, and a tu-

multuous rabble—Unless those should interpose, whose proper duty and peculiar interest it is, to resist the increasing torrent of popular phrenzy, the Constitution will be endangered ; I will not say destroyed.

In the establishment, I trust, every cause of complaint, if there exists any, will be *seasonably* removed. In the State I know of none. The patrimony of the Church is a sacred trust, vested in those who 'enjoy it ; particularly its rulers and dignitaries,' who ought to transmit its revenues unimpaired to their successors. We have seen how they have managed things in France. While we avoid the rock on which the Gallic Church was ship-wrecked, the Sons of the Church of England, I mean its Lay-Sons, the Clergy naturally, and the Friends of the Constitution of course, will never desert her but with the extinction of their lives.

It is to the Temporal in conjunction with the Spiritual Peers that we are to  
look

look up, to restore the proper tone and due equipoise to the State; and to preserve it from the Gallic contagion.

I do not know what the personal merits of the French Nobility were, nor those of their ancestors. Of this I am confident, that the body of the Peerage in this kingdom, with respect to illustrious descent, and personal worth, are the brightest ornaments in the annals of the most renowned States, from the earliest ages of the world.

Our Bishops, too, are men raised to their high stations from the purity of their manners, the profundity of their erudition, their loyalty to their King, and their eminent zeal and exertions in cause of their divine Master.

If, my Lords, and my fellow-citizens, we shew the same indefatigable zeal and industry; if we labour to defend, as our adversaries do, to ruin our excellent Constitution; neither the united efforts of the National Assembly in France, of their friends in England, no,  
not



not the gates of hell, shall prevail against it.

The interesting nature of my subject led me imperceptibly very far beyond the bounds I at first proposed to this letter. I have to apologize to a candid public for taking up so much room in a print so eminently distinguished for its resources of much more important information, and more interesting entertainment. I must also express my acknowledgment to the Proprietor of the DIARY for his ready insertion of the sentiments of an obscure individual, who has nothing to recommend them to the public attention, but their being the heart-felt effusions of his loyalty to his King, and of his attachment to the Constitution of his Country.

With regard to you, Gentlemen, I beg leave to subscribe myself

A *Dissenter* from your Society, but  
your sincere well-wisher as indi-  
vidual peaceful Citizens,

RICE HUGHES.

---

## POSTSCRIPT

**T**HOUGH the author of the foregoing letter has combated, in a cursory manner, the principles maintained by the friends of the Gallic Revolution in this country; yet, as an address and declaration has been recently published by an adjourned meeting of these men at the Thatched-house Tavern, he thinks it a duty incumbent upon him to bestow a few moments upon the subject of that declaration, merely for the purpose of noticing what appears to be of the most insidious, mischievous, and alarming complexion.

At a period when so many more able writers have stood forth in the defence of the English Constitution, the author of these strictures expects to be reckoned arrogant and assuming; to be stigmatized as the friend of aristocratic rule, or

regal tyranny. Conscious of the integrity of his intentions, he will speak his opinion, unawed by the frowns and criticisms of those whose views aim to inflame factions, and to introduce a scene of lawless confusion in the state.

The said address is inflammatory and bombastic. It begins with complaints of “ wilful misrepresentations ” of their principles and motives, “ by the partizans of arbitrary power, and the advocates of Court-government.” Thus in the first instance, these demagogues oppose themselves to the friends of legal monarchy! Their language supposes the existence of arbitrary sway in Britain, whose glory is—a regular and equitable system of freedom. It breathes, nay, avows a disaffection to Court-government.

Alluding to the Revolution in France, they say, “ We rejoice in the prospect which such a magnificent example opens to the world”—To England of course. “ The French have laid the axe to the  
root

foot of tyranny," (that is to say, of Court-government) have levelled all ranks, and extinguished all subordination. " They have bound their King with chains, and their Nobles with fetters of iron. " Such is the magnificent example which is presumed to gladden the world, and is held up for our imitation.

The French are said to be " erecting government on the sacred hereditary rights of man.—Rights which appertain to *all*, and not to any *one* more than to another."

Twenty five millions of people, possessed of equal rights to constitute and establish such government as best accords with the disposition, interest; and *ideal* happiness of each individual.

The legislative power, no doubt, originally emanated from the people. To deliberate upon national affairs in the aggregate is impracticable. The people being unfit to discuss public affairs, they

must act by their representatives, what they cannot act by themselves.'

According to the principles proposed in the paper which is the subject of the present animadversions, the poor and unlettered mechanic has an equal right to senatorial eligibility with those who are most distinguished for their superior wisdom and property in the State. Here it should be remarked, if the latter who possess the pre-eminence of birth, riches and honors, were confounded with the common people, and to have only the weight of a single vote, like the rest, the common liberty would be their slavery; and the former, who constitute the bulk of the people, and who have neither property nor principles, would have the popular resolutions in their favour. The most perfect equality of rights can never exclude the ascendancy of superior minds; and in no society are men classed without external distinctions. The whole body of the nation must be advised by the most respectable mem-  
bers

bers of it: and their share in the legislature ought to be proportioned to the interest they have in the general security of the State. Power and property are, and ought to be, inseparable.

In the first instance of political act, the constituents elect delegates. The majority impose a representative upon the minority. The national deputation assemble to lay the foundation; and to rear the superstructure of government.-- An assembly, which, instead of that dignity and freedom of debate which becomes the grand Council of a great nation, is characterized by levity, and the tumults of licentiousness.

The majority form a government, and frame laws binding on the minority, which, having an inherent indefeasible right to exercise their own judgment and option, because they would not approve, they would not assent to. In the name of common sense, what becomes of the sacred hereditary rights of man? Rights which appertain to *all*,

and not to any *one* more, than to another!

This shews the absurdities of propositions drawn from speculative principles, without considering practicability and experience. But to what lengths will not a desperate proceed? To create anarchy at all events, they would bewilder the nation, in the labyrinth of metaphysical theories, and political speculations.

“ We know of no human authority  
 “ superior to that of a whole nation. ”  
 This was penned in the plenitude of wisdom and philosophy! Had not the *Address* borne the name of a person recognized in the literary world of *politics*, but a name erased from the lists of all parties, till a recent opportunity to create mischief required talents and ingenuity, which the heads of the party would not dare openly to exercise and avow, and which few of them possessed in quality and degree better adapted to promote their common cause---Had it  
 not

not a direct tendency to poison the minds of the people by artful and malicious insinuations, it would have been equally below criticism or refutation. For there is a wide difference between the remonstrances of reason, and the insults of malice and envy, and the splenetic ebullitions of an intriguing and desperate faction.

If, for argument's sake, we suppose that a whole nation, with one heart, with one mind, with one voice, which is morally impossible, renovated or composed any form of a political constitution, where would be a cause of resistance? Unanimity precludes a collision of interests, or a competition of authority. Hence equal indefeasible rights, become a phantom, that can only exist in the disordered brains of unprincipled republicans.

“ We are immediately interested in this revolution.” Intrigue and ambition are vices represented to be inseparable from Court and Court-government. “ The French have conquered for us as well •



well as for themselves." For "that Court exists now no longer." The French royalty is levelled by the fatal instrument of democracy, as a tree falls whose roots the axe has severed. The French having given us this magnificent example, their revolution concerns us immediately. But they have not yet conquered for the party. While Englishmen are sensible of the blessings of a mild government, of peace and tranquillity, of the safety and security of their persons and property, and of the most substantial freedom ever yet enjoyed by man, they never shall conquer for those ungrateful *few*, who presumptuously personate the whole kingdom by adopting the plural pronouns of *We* and *Us*.

"Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, that would infuse deadly poison into the bosom of that country that cherishes and protects you, flee from the just resentment of an injured and indignant people."

"We

.. “ We are burthened with a heavy national debt.” Admitted. But from what cause has this debt originated? Was it from the intrigue and ambition of the British Court? No! The author, once for all, will instance the American war, as the prolific source of factious complaints. It would be superfluous to enter into a general view of its cause and effects. Suffice it to point out the prejudicial influence of faction on the councils and measures of Government. The following observation will apply to cases, too many to be now enumerated, and some of a very recent date:—

It is not a singular opinion that the grand transatlantic rebellion had terminated without much waste of blood or treasure, if our ungrateful American brethren, however supported by a neighbouring nation, had not been also supported by *traitors* in this country. What encouragement, what advantages of communication, must they have derived from British *patriots*, from per-

4

sons

sons of the brightest talents, and whose sagacity could penetrate and develop the most private councils and plans of administration! No wonder, as our councils were anticipated, counteracted, and defeated at home, our arms should be unsuccessful abroad—and when some of our first Statesmen mingled their tears over the fate of Montgomery, and exulted in the victories of Washington. Immense was the accession of debt to the national incumbrances from this unfortunate and long-continued contest. It was procrastinated by faction; to faction the bulk of this debt is to be imputed; and not to the intrigue and ambition of Court-government, whose object was rather the happiness and prosperity of this kingdom, and eventually of its American dependencies.

But the incessant complaints of a selfish and factious people against all administrations, resemble the conduct of the Carthaginian armies, which in the mo-  
ment

ment of danger and trial, deserted their General, and then crucified him because he did not *gain* the *victory*.

“ We hold, that a moral obligation  
 “ of providing for old age, helpless in-  
 “ fance ; and poverty, is far superior to  
 “ that of supplying the invented wants  
 “ of courtly extravagance, ambition,  
 “ and intrigue.” This doctrine seems  
 well from the Chairman, a quondam  
 Divine ; and which a superficial obser-  
 ver would applaud ;—but it is hypocrisy  
 and deceit. Old age, helpless infancy,  
 and poverty, have a bountiful provision  
 in this country, unequalled in the uni-  
 verse. But perhaps the lower order of  
 mechanics and labouring people are here  
 intended.—“ We have nothing to fear  
 from the poor, for we plead their cause !”  
 The common people, who make up the  
 majority of the nation, are wanted in the  
 scale of sedition ; but who are not yet in-  
 sensible of the blessings of equitable and  
 impartial laws, nor of the generous in-  
 dulgence of Government. For in per-  
 forming

forming the invidious task of raising the necessary supplies by additional taxes, the minister of finance is particularly scrupulous in exempting *the poor*, as much as possible, from their operation. But do these charitable men practise what they would seem to approve and promote? Do they remit any of their indigent tenants rents? Or increase the price of their labourers? Not a doit! "But they would feed them with a neighbour's ewe-lamb;" or say to the naked be ye clothed, and to the hungry be ye full, and leave them unrelieved.

But there is another description of men who are to be included under the denomination of poor. It has already been observed, that the poor and unfortunate, properly speaking, have the most ample and comfortable provision. The passage quoted, therefore, cannot relate to *them*. It must be *those* then who *want* money to lavish in the support of vanity, luxury, effeminacy, the splendor of dress, equipage, furniture, enter-

tertainments—and above all, to supply their exhausted funds for gaming.

The profusion of modern patriots, creates new and pressing necessities, which *honour* points to cabal and rapacity to supply. Hence their boundless and unwarranted pursuit of lucrative employments, for the gratification of these unmanly passions. Hence the national union is interrupted. Hence not only the consistency of all public measures, but their vigor and expedition, are weakened or thwarted. Thus a system of political interest is established among us for the end of dissipation.

To supply the *invented* wants of these demagogues, who are equally dissolute in opinion and practice, is far superior to the supplying of “the invented wants of courtly extravagance, ambition, and intrigue.” There is an obscurity in the meaning of “the invented wants of courtly extravagance:” But obscurity suits such a dark and insidious insinuation. If a

jealousy for the peace and happiness of a kingdom, if unwearied zeal and assiduity to promote and preserve its honour and aggrandisement, if caution and policy to defeat the treacherous stratagems and selfish pursuits of a needy and turbulent faction, be ambition and intrigue—the terms are not misapplied. These principles, however, exist, in their common acceptation, but not at court—They exist in the friends of the French Revolution.

Their “astonishment” will cease when they are told, that “no part, or  
 “any members of our government, re-  
 “probate the extinction of arbitrary  
 “power in France, or wish to see it  
 “restored.” We reprobate, however, the subversion of the Rights of Man under the pretence and sanction of that sacred principle. We reprobate the indignity and outrage offered to the Royal Family. We reprobate the violent extinction of the legitimate government—Instead of proceeding with temper and  
 moderation,

moderation, to meliorate it. We reprobate the French buccaniers for confiscating the property of individuals or bodies of men—Property—which, once settled and secured by the laws of the land, and confirmed by long possession, becomes inalienable. This is the general consent of nations, and the universal voice of mankind. The French Revolution having been fraught with rapacity, disloyalty, murder, cruelty, and injustice, has and deserves our hearty reprobation.

“ It is the policy of courts and court-  
 “ government, to prefer enemies to  
 “ friends, and a system of war to that  
 “ of peace, as affording more pretences  
 “ for places, offices, pensions, revenue,  
 “ and taxation ; it is high time for the  
 “ people (here prudence suppressed  
 what evil-disposed minds are left to  
 explore) “ to look with circumspection  
 “ to their own interests.” Mean, il-  
 liberal, and unjust are these suggestions.  
 —How dastardly are those spirits who  
 attack



attack with poisoned arrows, whom they can neither encounter or subdue by strength of reason and justice.—What enemies are preferred to friends ? In what instance has a system of war been preferred to that of honourable peace ?—But places, offices, and pensions are the grievances ! The two first, however, in the glaring absence of generous religion, disinterestedness and political integrity in the governed, are essential to the very existence of government. The last are the well-earned remuneration of eminent services to the state.

“ Those who pay the expence, and  
 “ *not* those who participate in the  
 “ emoluments arising from them, are  
 “ the persons immediately interested in  
 “ the abolition of places, offices, and  
 “ pensions.” *When* these reformers  
 have *succeeded* in their object, *they*  
 will, no doubt, with a public spirit,  
 offer their services in the different de-  
 partments of the state, without emolu-  
 ment or reward !

“ We

“ We consider the present opportunity of the French Revolution as a most happy one for lessening the enormous load of taxes under which this nation groans.”—Patriot offerings—church lands—the sacred utensils of the altar—the reduction of overgrown wealth—even chartered rights and charitable endowments, if productive, will all contribute to this great purpose. “ If this is not done ! ”—A *manœuvre* is manifestly intended here—but it is the menace of a Lilliputian tribe against the invincible Gullivers of the British constitution..

These pretended patriots wish to arrogate to themselves a merit which the minister has long ago anticipated. Has he not commenced a plan of liquidating the public debts ? Why has he not credit for his good intentions, and confidence in his future conduct, which the past has so well deserved ? The finances of this country will be retrieved, and its happiness and prosperity established and secured be-

yond example, by the wisdom, integrity, and unshaken courage of the present administration.

“ We think it also necessary to express our astonishment that a government, desirous of being called *free*, should prefer connections with the most despotic and arbitrary power in Europe.” Why not—if greater commercial advantages may be obtained? Britain has no concern with any particular mode of government in foreign countries.

“ Separated, as we happily are by nature, from the tumults of the continent, we reprobate all systems and intrigues which sacrifice the blessings of our natural situation.” Let us consider how far these blessings are affected by continental tumults. The ambition of the Empress of Russia is avowedly great; her dominions already are of a magnitude not generally known or considered. Her troops have evinced discipline and intrepidity inferior to none. The situation of this empire  
too

too has superior and peculiar advantages for the most extensive commerce. If the Russians cultivated traffic, they would, of course, regard their navy and improve it for its protection; and which, in return, would supply it with experienced sailors. If the Empress then had been permitted to take possession of the European territories of the Porte—with which, most likely, she would not have been satisfied—other neighbouring powers would, probably, soon fall into the vortex of her ambition. The Russian armies and fleets, under the sway of fierce ambition, and a desire of conquest, bearing proportion to the population, and the flourishing---wide-extended trade of this boundless empire, would become a terror to *all Europe*. The author's heart, indeed, dilates with conscious pride, when he pays this just tribute of distinction to our brave soldiers and intrepid tars—that, in valour and discipline, they *greatly* excel those of all other nations

in the world. But they are neither immortal nor invincible. If a far superior fleet overspread our channel—if a far superior army approached our shores—would our cliffs protect us?—What then would become of “the blessings of our natural situation?” Whenever the balance of power in Europe fails—Britain will become the first victim to triumphant ambition, to jealousy, and to revenge!

But the nation which we preserved from impending fate, are infidels.—Cruel and presumptuous men! To grasp the sceptre of Omnipotence, and to usurp the distribution of eternal justice! Their religious tenets are amenable to the tribunal of God alone!

As men they claim from us, individually, the offices of humanity. As a nation, on whose existence the equilibrium in the scale of the powers of Europe depends, they demand, in policy, the interference of an effectual arbitration.

In this important business, our administration have acted with a spirit becoming the dignity of their country, and with wisdom and policy becoming their arduous and confidential situations.

The events of negotiations are often precarious ; remonstrances and arguments, drawn from reason and justice, upon these occasions, often fail of their desired effect ; but the minister, to prevent the calamities of war, and the effusion of British blood, which had been probably the consequence of a dastardly conduct, had not only the wisdom to propose equitable and salutary terms of peace, but evinced a firm courage and resolution to *enforce* them if obstinately rejected.

This small island has been said to be the “ sole *arbiter* of the affairs of “ Christendom.” Under this appropriate character, the British court never shone with greater lustre, or acted with better effect. Virtue and temperance, general humanity and sincerity, wis-

dom to plan, and courage to execute, are it's distinguishing gems, and which *will make a splendid figure in the historical cabinet of this country.*

The late dispute respecting Nootka Sound, has afforded another example of the rancour and malignity of faction. The question is not, of what magnitude, but whether *any* insult or injury was offered or sustained? An individual, from a sense of honour, and a tenacity of his right, will, with manliness, resent an insult to the former—and will endeavour to protect from encroachment the latter. The sense of national honour and right is, beyond comparison, greater than that of an individual. The first exceeds the last, in dignity and acuteness, far beyond the proportion of one to the whole of the people of this realm. If a Briton is so tenacious of his honour and his right—shall Britain dastardly submit to an indignity and encroachment from any power upon earth?

“ If

“ If we are asked what government  
 “ is ?—we hold it to be nothing more  
 “ or less than a national association.”

*This answer is very indefinite ; but we  
 may form some idea of this new-fan-  
 gled government, from the tenor of  
 the address. Court-government is the  
 reiterated subject of reprobation—  
 consequently a national association can  
 mean no other kind of government,  
 and is nothing more or less than an un-  
 qualified democracy..*

The author, here, cannot forbear  
 making a serious remark. He admits  
 indeed, that an individual may, with  
 perfect freedom, communicate his opi-  
 nion in private, upon a *legal topic* ; but  
 from the moment of publication, he as-  
 sumes a responsibility for it to the pub-  
 lic, who are interested in its effects. Let  
 government, let the public gravely de-  
 termine upon this important matter.  
 To them the Author appeals !

If the said address and declaration  
 breathes the spirit of liberty, it is the  
 liberty



liberty of licentiousness and downright sedition.

“ From the feudal system England “ is not yet free.”—As free as it can be, consistent with absolute un-oppressive property. But there are Lords—hated superiority of rank !

With regard to the game laws—they are salutary, and have a moral effect ; they keep the poor from habits of idleness, which is the parent of dishonesty and plunder, and often leads to an ignominious end. They are made also, very properly, a source of revenue.

What monopolies are here censured, and of “ numerous kinds” too, the Author is at a loss to comprehend. Unless they are understood to mean, that all merchants and tradesmen, whether fools or knaves, whether industrious and frugal, or idle and dissipated, should have an equal share of custom and profits apportioned to each : for it is a *notorious* fact, that, many  
 merchant

merchants and tradesmen accumulate large fortunes, while great numbers become *bankrupts*.

Particular privileges from letters patent may be deemed a *monopoly*. When a man has racked his brain, wasted his fortune, and a great part of his life, in the production of a work of ingenuity, and which proves of superior utility to public and domestic purposes, it is a *great hardship*, that the King, to reward past, and to encourage future inventions of art, should patronize him with an exclusive sale for a short term of years, to repay his expences and his toil, and to provide for his family.

The Indian trade is indeed circumscribed. But the public derive an ample compensation for the monopoly.

“ Rejoicing, as we sincerely do, in the freedom of others (of the French) *till* we shall happily accomplish our *own*.”

It is a matter of astonishment how a parallel can be drawn between our free government

government and the absolute monarchy of France. Let us do justice to our civil and ecclesiastical polity. We enjoy the greatest plenitude of freedom. —We enjoy a political constitution, superior to all that history hath recorded, or present times can boast. We enjoy a religious establishment, which breathes universal charity and toleration. An administration of justice that hath even silenced envy, and extends its protection to the poor and the great in an equal degree. Where each dwell safely, “every man under his vine, “and under his fig-tree;” and peace surrounds their habitations ! These are blessings which every Englishman feels, and ought to acknowledge. Compare this picture with the most admired periods of the most admired countries, and its superiority will appear eminently conspicuous. A volume might be written in proof of this assertion.

But

But there are defects irremediable free governments. The liberty of propagating the most licentious opinions one of the greatest. The disease is bad but the cure would be fatal. .

Thus freedom is compelled to admit an enemy, which under pretence and in form of an ally, often proves fatal to her existence.

“ As for riots and tumults, let those  
 “ answer for them who endeavour to  
 “ excite and promote them.” Their  
 republicans have pronounced the sen-  
 tence of their own condemnation. *We*  
 labour to preserve the public peace  
*They* labour to disturb it, and to break  
 down every barrier of order, every  
 restraint of law, by *stunning* the sense  
 of the nation, and instigating an un-  
 principled and misinformed mob to  
 acts of rapacity and rebellion.

To watch the plots and artifices of  
 the enemies of our Country, and to

crush the hydra of a malignant and dangerous faction.——

“ These are our object, and we will pursue it.”

*Aldenham,*  
*Sept. 9, 1791.*

*F F N I S.*

AN  
E S S A Y  
ON THE  
P O P U L A T I O N  
O F  
E N G L A N D,  
From the R E V O L U T I O N to the  
present Time:

WITH  
A N A P P E N D I X,

C O N T A I N I N G

REMARKS on the Account of the Popu-  
lation, Trade, and Resources of the  
Kingdom, in Mr. EDEN's Letters to  
Lord CARLISLE.

---

By RICHARD PRICE, D.D. F.R.S.

---

L O N D O N :

Printed for T. CADELL, in the Strand.

M. DCC. LXXX.



## P R E F A C E.

THE following Essay was published last summer, at the end of Mr. Morgan's Treatise on the *Doctrine of Annuities and Assurances on Lives and Survivorships*.—Mr. Eden having, in his Fifth Letter to Lord Carlisle, made several objections to it, I now offer it to the Public in a separate tract, with an *Appendix* containing a reply to his objections.—At the end of the *Appendix* are added a few observations on Mr. Eden's account of the trade and resources of the kingdom. I feel myself deeply impressed with a conviction



viction of the importance of these observations ; but, at the same time, I know that I may possibly be under the influence of those undue byasses to which Mr. Eden ascribes the apprehensions which many now entertain of the public danger. I therefore refer all I have said to the candid attention of those who may chuse to consider it, wishing them to pay no more regard to it than the evidence which will be laid before them shall render unavoidable.

May 8, 1780.

## C O N T E N T S

<i>ACCOUNTS of the number of houses in</i>	
<i>•London and Middlesex, at different pe-</i>	
<i>riods, with observations</i>	— p. 1, &c.
<i>Accounts of the number of houses in ENGLAND</i>	
<i>and WALES at different periods, with obser-</i>	
<i>vations</i>	— — — p. 9, &c.
<i>Progress of depopulation, with facts confirming</i>	
<i>it</i>	— — — p. 17, &c.
<i>Causes of our depopulation</i>	- p. 29, &c.
<i>State of population in other countries, Sweden,</i>	
<i>Naples, France, &amp;c.</i>	- p. 30, &c.
<i>APPENDIX, containing remarks on Mr. Eden's</i>	
<i>account of the population, trade, and resources</i>	
<i>of the kingdom</i>	— p. 36, &c.
<i>State and fluctuations of London from the Re-</i>	
<i>formation</i>	— — — p. 55, &c.
<i>Present state of the kingdom with respect to its</i>	
<i>trade and resources</i>	— p. 64, &c.
<i>Comparison of the expence of the last war with</i>	
<i>the expence of the present war</i>	p. 70, &c.
<i>CONCLUSION</i>	— — — p. 73, &c.
<i>ACCOUNTS of the navy-debt, loan, unfunded</i>	
<i>debt, &amp;c. in 1762 and 1780</i>	p. 77, &c.

## ERRATUM.

In the Table p. 6, the Number 3338 ought to  
to have been given as the number of houses,  
and not of families, in Manchester.

# OBSERVATIONS

ON

## The POPULATION of ENGLAND and WALES.

IT will be proper to introduce these observations with the following accounts of LONDON and MIDDLESEX.

*Number of Houses in LONDON, SOUTH-WARK, WESTMINSTER, and the COUNTY OF MIDDLESEX, in the Year 1777; from the Accounts of the Surveyors of the House, and Window Duties.*

Houses charged in 1777, having 25				
windows and upwards.	—	—	—	12,560
Houses charged, having less than				
25 windows	—	—	—	61,080
Total of houses charged	—	—	—	73,640
Uninhabited houses chargeable	—	—	—	3,368
Total of houses charged and charge-				
able	—	—	—	77,008
Cottages not charged by reason of				
poverty	—	—	—	13,562
Total of houses	—	—	—	90,570
	B			Number

## *Observations on the Population*

*Number of Houses in London, Southwark, Westminster, and the County of Middlesex, from the Survey mentioned by Dr. Brackenridge in a Paper read to the Royal Society in March 1758, and published in the Philosophical Transactions, vol. 50, p. 471.*

Houses charged to the house and window tax in 1757	—	—	63,480
Houses uninhabited	—	—	4,810
Total of houses charged and chargeable	—	—	68,290
Cottages	—	—	19,324
Total of houses, including cottages	—	—	87,614

### R E M A R K S.

These accounts shew, that the number of houses in *London, Westminster, Southwark, and all Middlesex* had, in the course of about 20 years preceding 1778, increased 2,956 in the whole; but that the houses excused on account of poverty had decreased 5,762; from whence it follows, that the houses *charged* and *chargeable* had increased 8,718. —It should be considered, that most probably this is less than the real increase of

the best sort of houses; for the decrease of the cottages proves, that the meanest of the houses\* which pay the tax must likewise have decreased; and this decrease is to be added to 8,718, in order to obtain the whole increase of the best houses; for it is obvious that, if the best houses had not increased as much as the worst decreased, the total of houses, instead of being greater in 1777, must have been less.—Perhaps, therefore, we shall reckon moderately enough, if we reckon an increase within the last 20 years of 10,000 substantial houses in and about *London*; and this is a number that falls little short of the whole number of houses in *Liverpool* and *Manchester*.

The increase of buildings in *London* has for several years been the object of general

\* That is, houses paying the house duty of 3s. only. The number of these houses in 1777 was 5,738; but I have no account of it for any preceding year. It will appear presently, that taking *England* in the gross, there has been a great decrease in these houses; and this makes it almost certain they must have decreased in *Middlesex*.—The decrease of cottages, or houses excused, since 1757, is the more remarkable, because the house and window duties have been increased since that year by three different acts of parliament, the first in 1758, the second in 1762, and the third in 1766.

observation. It deserves particular notice that it is derived entirely from the increase of luxury; an evil which, while it flatters, never fails to destroy.\* It has been shewn from authentic accounts, that the decrease of the lower people in *London* and *Middlesex* has kept pace with the increase of buildings. The annual deaths also in the Bills of Mortality have for many years been decreasing, and are now near 6,000 *per annum* less than they were fifty years ago. In particular; it is observable with respect to that part of *London* which lies within the city walls, that, though always filled with houses, the births and burials, and, consequently, the inhabitants\*, have decreased ONE HALF.—The just account of this must be, that those who cannot now satisfy themselves without whole houses, or, perhaps, two or three houses, to live in, used formerly to be satisfied with lodgings, or with parts of houses.

The number of *houses* in *London*, *Westminster*, and all *Middlesex*, in 1690, was

See a particular account of this fact in my *Observations on Reversionary Payments*, page 190, 3d edit.

111,215, according to Dr. *Davenant's* account from the *Hearth-books*\*.

• I will only further observe concerning the preceding accounts, that they demonstrate that the number of inhabitants in London has been greatly over-rated. They have been sometimes estimated at a million. In an Essay on the State of London, on Population, &c. in the Treatise on Reversionary Payments, I offered evidence, which I thought little short of demonstration, to prove that they fell short of 651,000. But it now appears that, allowing 6 to a house, and including the whole county of Middlesex, their number in 1777 was only 543,420.

That six to a house for London, and five to a house for all England, is too large an allowance, will be proved by the following recital of facts.

\* See Dr. *Davenant's* works, vol. III, page 38. This number does not include *Southwark*.—The average of burials for five years in London before the present year, or 1780, was 20779. The average for five years before 1696 was 22,742; that is, considerably greater than it has been for the last five years, though twelve parishes, now the most populous, were not then included in the Bills.



In Nottingham, according to a survey in Sept. 1779, exclusive of 294 in hospitals and workhouses	Houses, Families	Inhabitants,	17,417	{ To a house, 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ . To a family 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ .
Norwich, according to a survey in 1732	7,139	—	36,169	— To a house, 5.
Shrewsbury, by a survey in 1750	3,078	—	13,328	— 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ .
Northampton, by a survey in 1746	1,083	—	5,136	— 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ .
The parish of Ackworth, Yorkshire, in 1267	184	—	728	— 4.
Newbury, Berkshire, in 1768	930	—	3,732	— 4.
Speen, adjoining to Newbury, in 1768	303	—	1,200	— 4.
Aldwinckle, Northamptonshire, in 1772	95	—	402	— 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ .
The parish of Holy Cross, near Shrews- bury, in 1760	242	—	1,050	— 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ .
Altringham, Cheshire, in 1772	248	—	1,029	— 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ .
The Parish of St. Michael's, Chester, in 1772	127	—	618	— 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ .
The town and parish of Bala, North- Wales, in 1774	401	—	1,723	— 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ .
Fifty-nine Dutch villages mentioned by Struyk	12,005	—	45,888	— 3 $\frac{1}{2}$ .
Birmingham, in 1770	6,025	—	30,804	— 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ .
Liverpool, in 1773, including 400 in the Poor-house	6,340	—	34,407	— 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ .

Manchester and Salford, in 1773	Families	4,333	Inhabitants	27,245	6½
Leeds, in 1775	Families	4,596	—	17,121	To a family 4½
The District of Vaud in Switzerland	Families	25,778	—	112,951	4½
Chester, in 1774	Families	3,428	—	14,713	4½
Rome, in 1770	Families	37,449	—	158,442	4½
Calne, Wiltshire	Families	770	—	3,467	4½
Liverpool	Families	8,002	—	34,457	4½
Manchester	Families	6,416	—	25,246	4½
Bolton in Lancashire, in 1773, including Little Bolton	Houses	13,778	—	5,339	To a house, 4½
Bury in Lancashire, in 1772	Houses	463	—	2,090	4½
The parish of Bala in North-Wales, in 1774	Houses	401	—	1,723	4½
Chippenham, Wilts, in 1773	Houses	483	—	2,407	5
Brenhill, near Calne, in Wiltshire	Houses	218	—	1,206	5½
The Island of Sicily (see end of 2d vol. of Brydone's Travels)	Houses	268,120	—	1,123,163	4½
Fourteen market towns mentioned by Dr. Short, Comparative History, page 58	Families	20,371	—	97,611	To a family 4½
Sixty-five country parishes, <i>ibid.</i>	Families	17,208	—	76,284	4½

In the Parish of <i>Skelton</i> , Yorkshire, in 1777	— Houses	139	— Inhabitants,	506	— To a house, 4 $\frac{1}{2}$
The town and parish of Wycombe, Bucks	— Families	500	—	2,461	— To a family, 4 $\frac{9}{10}$
Worley, Barton, Pandlebury, and Clifton, Lancashire, in 1778	— Families	1,685	—	9,117	— 5 $\frac{1}{2}$
Parish of St. Cuthbert, Edinburgh, in 1743 (see Maitland's History of Edinburgh, page 171)	— Families	2,370	—	9,731	— 4 $\frac{1}{10}$
In a number of small towns and parishes in the Generalities of Auvergne, Lyon, and Rouen, in France (see <i>Recherches sur la Population</i> , par M. Messance, pages 8, 26, and 62)	— Families	24,921	—	99,332	— 4 $\frac{1}{10}$
Parish of Manchester, exclusive of the town, in 1774	— Families	2,525	—	13,786	— 5 $\frac{1}{2}$
Parish in the city of London (see Phil. Trans. part 2d, page 796)	— Houses	2,412	—	13,786	— To a house, 5 $\frac{1}{10}$
	—	—	—	—	— .6 to a house.

*Number of Houses in England and Wales,  
from the Returns of the Surveyors of the  
House and Window Duties in 1761 and  
1777.*

In 1761.—In 1777.

Houses charged, having 25. windows and up- wards — — —	* 32,595 — 32,595
Houses having 21, 22, 23 and 24 windows. —	<u>12,404 — 14,623</u>
Total of houses having more than 25 windows	44,999 — 47,218
Houses having from 12 to 20 windows. —	<u>88,494 — 98,756</u>
Total of houses having more than 11 windows	133,493 — 145,974
Houses having 8, 9, 10, and 11 windows —	<u>102,525 — 117,857</u>
Total of houses having more than 7 windows	236,018 — 263,831

\* In the returns for 1761 this number is wanting. I have, therefore, supposed it the same that it was found to be in 1777. But the truth is, that it must have been less, as will appear presently.

A full return has been given by Mr. Greenville in his *Report on the Trade and Finances of the Kingdom*, 1766; but I have been informed from the tax-

\* Of it was made in 1761.

were *dis*ct

C

Increase .

10      *Observations on the Population*

	In 1761.	In 1777.
Increase in 1777 of houses having from 8 to 24 windows. — — —		27,813
Houses charged having 7 windows — — *		131,950
Total of houses paying the window tax —	236,018	395,781
Houses paying only the house tax of 3s. —	442,897	286,296
Total of houses charged	678,915	682,077
Increase in 1777 of houses charged / — —		3,462
Houses uninhabited, but chargeable —	†25,628	19,396
Total of houses charged and chargeable —	704,543	701,473

\*. The number of houses in 1761, having exactly seven windows, was 400,273; but by the law, as it then stood, all such houses were exempted from the window tax. In 1766 the tax was extended to these houses; and the consequence was, that near two thirds of them were reduced to houses having only six windows.

† The decrease which may be here observed in the number of empty, but chargeable, houses, is an effect which could not but attend the greater density of houses which produced the increase between 1777, of houses having more than seven windows.

Paris  
the town,  
Parish in the city part  
Phil. Tract. part.

	In 1761	In 1777.
Decrease in 1777 of houses charged and chargeable — — —		3,070
Cottages excused on ac- count of poverty only	276,149	251,261
Total of houses charged, chargeable, and ex- cused — — —	980,692	952,734
Decrease of houses charged, charge- able, and excused, from 1765 to 1777 — — — — —		27,958
this decrease add the increase of houses having from 8 to 24 win- dows, or — — — —		27,813

And the total will shew, that the number of houses not having eight windows was 55,771 less, in 1777, than it had been in 1761.

Again; from 27,813, the increase in 1777 of houses having from 8 to 24 windows, subtract 3,162, the increase of houses charged, having less than 25 windows; and it will appear, that in the houses charged, having 7 windows or less, there has been in the same period a decrease of 24,651 houses.

Of these cottages, 7369 had been charged, but were discharged by appeal in 1777.

—But this is by no means the whole decrease of houses of this sort. The increase of houses having more than 24 windows ought to be added; but the number of such houses not having been given in the return for 1761, it does not appear what this increase has been. It seems, however, past doubt, that there must have been such an increase, because all other houses having more than seven windows had increased.

NUMBER OF HOUSES IN ENGLAND AND WALES in 1759, from the Return of the Surveyors of the House and Window Duties.

Houses charged in 1759	—	—	679,142
Uninhabited houses in 1759 charge- able	—	—	24,904
Houses excused on account of po- verty only	—	—	282,429
Total of houses in 1759	—	—	986,482
— — — — — in 1761, see p. 11,			980,692
— — — — — in 1777, see p. 11,			952,734
Diminished in 18 years from 1759	—	—	33,748
Number of houses charged in 1756	—	—	690,702
	3		Number

Number of houses charged and	
chargeable in 1750* — —	729,048
Deduct 25,000, and the charged	
houses in 1750 will be — —	704,048
Total of houses according to the	
Hearth-books of Lady-day,	
1690† — — — —	1,319,215
Total of houses from the	
Hearth-books in 1666‡ —	1,230,000

\* In the former edition of this essay, I had, on the authority of Dr. Brackenridge, (in the *Philosophical Transactions*, vol. 46, part 1st, p. 270,) given this as a return in 1710; but I have lately been informed from the tax office that it was made in 1750, and that it includes the chargeable houses.

† This account is given on the authority of Dr. Davenant. See his works, vol. 1st, page 38, where the number of houses, and also of hearths, is given separately for each county.—In page 130 he says, that “the hearth tax had given a view *certain enough* of the number of families in the kingdom.”

‡ See Tindal's Continuation of Papin's History, vol. 1st, page 53.—Dr. Davenant says, that from 1666 to 1688 there had been about 70,000 new foundations laid. See his works, vol. 1st, page 37.—It is probable that the civil war in the time of King Charles the First, and the emigrations which then took place, lessened the number of people in the kingdom: and therefore, in Queen Elizabeth's time, or about the Reformation, the number of inhabitants in England might have been greater than it was even at the Revolution, agreeably to the facts mentioned at the end of my *Appeal to the Public on the Subject of the National Debt*, page 87, &c.



## OBSERVATIONS on the foregoing Accounts.

First. The first of these accounts makes the number of houses in England and Wales in 1777 to be 952,734. Let it, however, be stated at a MILLION. Five persons to a house is too large an allowance, as appears from the accounts in page 6, &c. It follows, therefore, that the number of inhabitants in *England and Wales* must be short of FIVE MILLIONS. In the kingdom of ~~Sweden~~ the number of inhabitants was 2,440,394 in 1763.—In the kingdom of *NAPLES* (one of the *Two Sicilies*) it was 4,311,503, in 1777.—In all *FRANCE*, 25,741,320, in 1772\*.

These

\* The account here given of *Sweden* is taken from actual surveys of the kingdom in 1737, 1760, and 1763. In the full of these years the inhabitants, of all ages, were found to be 2,373,195; in the second, 2,367,498; in the third, 2,440,394. See a Memoir by M. Wangentin in the 15th vol. of the *Collection Academique*, printed at Paris, 1772. The account of the kingdom of *Naples* is also given from surveys made there every year, and published in the Court Calendars.—In 1766, the number of inhabitants was 3,771,234; in 1772, 4,040,682; in 1777, 4,311,503.

The Intendants of provinces in *France* were, in 1770, 1771, and 1772, ordered to make returns of the number of deaths, births, and marriages in their respective districts.

These facts shew, in a striking light, the superiority which arts, commerce, science, industry, and liberty give to a people.

ENGLAND

districts. The annual average of deaths for these three years was 780,040. See a *Treatise On the Legislation and Commerce of Corn*, printed at Paris in 1775, and translated into English, and published in London in 1776, page 42.—I have been assured by the ingenious author, now the Director-general of the finances of France, that this account may be depended on as rather below the truth; and it affords a decisive proof that the number of inhabitants in France cannot be less than that stated above, or 25,741,320, which is the product of the average of deaths multiplied by 33. That this is the least multiplier which ought to be used will appear undeniably from the following facts.—In Sweden, the average of deaths for 9 years ending in 1763, was 69,125, or a 45th part and two-fifths nearly of the inhabitants. See Mr. ~~Argentin's~~ *Memoir* just referred to.—In the kingdom of Naples, the average of deaths for 5 years before 1778, was 113,812, or a 37th and a third of the inhabitants.—These facts (and many others of the same kind may be found in the *Treatise on Reversionary Payments*, page 200) convince me that the average of annual deaths in France might have been multiplied by 35 instead of 33, and this would have brought out the number of inhabitants 27,301,400.—The same conclusion nearly may be drawn from the births in France, the average of which for five years ending in 1774, was 928,918. See *Recherches sur la Population de la France*, par M. Moreau, printed at Paris in 1778, page 147.—In Sweden, the average of annual births for 9 years, ending in 1763, was 90,240, or a 27th part and a tenth of the inhabitants.—In the king-

ENGLAND does not consist of many more inhabitants than the kingdom of NAPLES; but in respect of dignity, weight and force, the kingdom of NAPLES, compared with it, is *nothing*. Not long ago, this little island, with its dependencies, like the state of ATHENS formerly among the *Greeks*, was the arbiter of EUROPE, and more than a match for all the three kingdoms I have mentioned, with SPAIN added to them.

Secondly. The great disparity between the numbers of people in the higher and the lower ranks of life seems to deserve particular observation, as it may be collected from the foregoing accounts. Families living in houses having *seven* windows or less, must consist of persons in the lowest stations; and yet, the number of these houses was 688,903 in 1777. Add to ~~these~~ such of

dom of Naples, the average of annual births for 5 years, ending in 1777, was 166,808, or a 25th part and four-fifths of the inhabitants. The medium is  $26\frac{1}{2}$ , which multiplied by 928,918, gives 24,616,327. — But it is certain, that a greater multiplier than  $26\frac{1}{2}$  ought to be used in this case, because the births exceed the deaths considerably less in *France* than in either *Sweden* or *Naples*. — Upon the whole, therefore, I reckon that it appears with sufficient evidence that the inhabitants of *France* may very moderately be stated at the number I have given.

the lowest people as live in the remaining 263,653 houses; and it will appear, that the people of property and opulence in the state, compared with the rest, are indeed a very small body. And yet their number is now greater in this country than it ever was; and, very probably, it is much greater in this country than in any other.—It is proper to add, that this observation shews us distinctly why no taxes in a state can be very productive which do not reach the lower as well as higher ranks of people.

But, thirdly, What requires most to be attended to is the certain evidence which the preceding accounts give of the progress of depopulation in this kingdom.—The number of houses in ENGLAND and WALES

\* In ENGLAND, the houses having more than *four* windows are above a *fourth* of all the houses. In SCOTLAND, the number of houses having more than *five* windows, and paying the house and window duties, was, in 1777, only 16,206; and consequently could not be above a *fifteenth* of all the houses.—Agreeably to this poverty, the people of SCOTLAND, though more than a *fifth* of Britain, do not contribute more than a *fiftieth* to the revenue.—And it is also remarkable that of 4,376,171*l.* gold coin deficient between six and three grains, and brought in by the proclamation in 1774, to be re coined, only 52,984*l.* was brought from SCOTLAND. The sum brought in from IRELAND, in consequence of the same proclamation, was 394,201*l.*

was at the REVOLUTION 1,319,215. The number of houses now is not a *million*. Our people, therefore, since that era, have decreased near a *quarter*.—This appears distinctly, as far as Dr. Davenant's account is to be depended on\*. The following facts and observations will confirm this account, and furnish us with some additional evidence on this subject.

First. It appears, that there has been a very great decrease, since the Revolution, in the produce of a tax called the *hereditary and temporary excise*. This excise (almost the only one that existed before the Revolution) consists chiefly of 2*s.* 6*d.* per barrel on all strong beer or ale above 6*s.* the barrel, and 6*d.* on every barrel of ale sold at 6*s.* or less; and also a duty of 2*s.* 6*d.* per hoghead on cyder and perry; a duty on mead, strong waters, and low wines and spirits. The gross annual produce of this tax for three years, ending at 1689, was (as appears from the Excise books) 740,147*l.*

Some may suspect that Dr. Davenant has, by mistake, taken from the Hearth-books the number of *houses* in the kingdom, when he ought to have taken the number of *families*. But this is improbable; and if true, will make no great difference, as may be inferred from the accounts in page 6, &c.

—Its gross annual produce for four years, ending in 1768, was 527,991*l.* It has decreased, therefore, 212,156*l. per annum.* One of the reasons of this decrease has been, that in 1736, the duties on low wines and spirits (amounting then to 70,000*l. per ann.*) were taken from the Hereditary and Temporary Excise, and carried to the Aggregate fund. Deduct\*, therefore, 70,000*l.* from 212,156; and the real decrease will be 142,156*l.* And this decrease will appear more remarkable, when it is considered how much less the currency and wealth of the kingdom were before the Revolution than they are now:—It may be said, that more wine is now drank; but this, being confined to the higher classes of people, makes no great difference.—It may with more reason be objected, that the lower people drink now greater quantities of spirituous liquors, and therefore less ale. With respect to this, it seems sufficient to observe,

This is too great a deduction; for the use of spirituous liquors was in 1736 so much increased, that it became necessary to restrain it by additional duties.—The produce of that part of this Hereditary and Temporary excise which consists of the tax upon beer only, was 674,387*l.* in 1688; and 694,476*l.* in 1689. See D. Davenant's works, vol. 1st. page 175.

that it appears from the Excise books that the use of spirituous liquors never sunk the produce of this excise more than about 40,000*l.* in a year; and that since 1751 it has been so much checked by new regulations, additional duties, and other causes, that most probably it does not prevail much more now than it did at the Revolution. After allowing, therefore, for the operation of this cause\*, (and also for the increased use of wine) there will remain a diminution unaccounted for, of at least 100,000*l.* *per annum.*

In conformity to this fact, it appears that there has been a proportionable diminution in the quantity of beer brewed for sale, and in the number of victuallers.—For three years, ended in 1689, the annual average of

\* The following fact will confirm what is here said, and shew the progress of gin-drinking in the kingdom.—The use of spirituous liquors prevailed most in 1750 and 1751; and the annual average of spirits drawn from malted corn, cyder, melasses, and brewers' wash in those two years was 11,326,976 gallons.—In 1752 and 1753 it was 7,500,000 gallons.—In 1707 and 1768 it had sunk to 2,663,568 gallons.—In 1730 and 1731, it was 6,658,788 gallons.—In 1692 and 1693, it was 2,329,487 gallons.

In 1767 and 1768 the annual average of exciseable brandy imported was 2,612,631 gallons.—In 1688 and 1689, it was 1,713,974.

strong

Strong barrels brewed for sale was 5.055,870. The average of small barrels was 2.582,248. — For three years, ended in 1768,\* the former \* average was 3.925,131; the latter 1.886,760.—The average of common victuallers in the whole kingdom for the former three years† was 47,343; for the latter three years, 34,867.—This last fact, seems of particular consequence, because victuallers in both periods include all that keep houses for selling any strong liquors;

\* It is natural to suspect that this decreased consumption of beer must have been owing to the increase of the taxes upon it. But this does not appear; for in 1761, (after an addition in 1760 of 3*d.* per bushel to the duty on malt) an addition was made to this tax of 3*s.* per barrel, and yet it produced in the following years either more in proportion than it did before.—The quantity likewise of strong beer brewed for sale increased a little afterwards; though these two additions were so considerable as to bring into the revenue near 900,000*l.* per annum. In 24 years from 1740 to 1764, the taxes were more than doubled, and yet at the end of this term there was hardly a single tax which did not produce more than ever.

† For 10 years before the check given to the use of spiritous liquors in 1751, the victuallers in the kingdom amounted to near 48,000, though the quantity of strong beer brewed annually for sale was then less than it has been for the last 15 years. This, I suppose, must have been owing to the vast numbers of shops for selling gin, which, during that period, were opened every where.

and



and because also there is reason to believe, that the private brewery \*, of which no account is taken, was greater formerly than it is now.—I cannot help adding, as a farther fact, indicating a particular degree of populousness at the Revolution, that King William wanting, in 1689, to raise 23 new regiments for the war in Ireland, the levies were completed in six weeks. See Sir John Dalrymple's *Memoirs of Great Britain*, vol. 1st, page 384.—But what is most of all decisive in the present question is, the depopulation which has certainly taken place lately in this kingdom.

\* The number of common brewers in the whole kingdom in 1687 and 1689 was 776; in 1767 and 1768 it was increased to 1083. One reason of this must be, that fewer victuallers and private people now brew their own beer.—It is remarkable, that the number of brewers in London *decreased* during the same period from 187 to 157; and also that the quantity of small and strong beer brewed for sale *decreased* from 1,958,859 to 1,533,242 gallons. And this seems to confirm what has been already suggested, that even London is less populous now than it was at the Revolution. See page 4.

This decrease was gradual and slow till 1726. After 1726 it became considerable; and for some years before 1750, the quantity of beer consumed in London was about 100,000 gallons *per annum* less than it is now, in consequence undoubtedly, of the excessive use of spirituous liquors which then took place in London more than

• wine

From

From the preceding accounts it appears, that between the years 1761 and 1777 a destruction has taken place of at least 55,771 houses having less than 8 windows; which is equal to the loss of above a *quarter of a million* of those inhabitants who furnish recruits for our navy and army, and trading ships, and who, therefore, constitute the main strength of the kingdom.

I am not sensible that any thing can be objected to the evidence from which this conclusion has been drawn, except that there is an uncertainty in the returns of the cottages, because the surveyors, though directed to include them in their returns, take their number with less accuracy, no duty being paid for them. But it should be observed,

First, That this uncertainty does not at all affect the evidence for the diminution of houses *charged* having less than eight windows, and of which exact accounts are kept.

Secondly, The returns of the cottages have not, I suppose, been made with less care for 1777 than for 1761; and it is the difference only on which the conclusion I have drawn depends.

But, thirdly, The diminution which there has certainly been in the houses  
*charged*

*charged* having less than eight windows, proves undeniably, that there must have been a proportionable decrease in the cottages *not* charged.

Between the years 1759 and 1761 there appears in the returns a diminution of only 234 in the houses charged. But it should be remembered, that the higher sort of houses having increased between 1761 and 1777, the causes (which will be explained presently) of that increase must probably have begun to operate sooner, and checked the decrease, which (as may be distinctly seen in the *Postscript*) had been going forward before that period.

Before 1759 it appears that the houses *charged* had diminished 25,899 in nine years; and that since 1759, houses having less than eight windows have diminished 61,561 in eighteen years. These are facts which shew plainly, that the depopulation since the Revolution cannot have been less than it is stated in page 18.

The Honourable Mr. Grenville, in a pamphlet entitled *Considerations on the Trade and Finances of the Kingdom*, after giving the same account with that here given of the houses in *England and Wales* in 1759  
and

and 1761, expresses the utmost surprize at the proofs of depopulation which it afforded, and observes, “ that the destruction of 5790 houses in so short a space as \* *eight years*, is such a symptom of distress as requires every attention to check the progress of the evil.—Relief to the landed interest is now (he adds) no longer the concern of individuals only who are to receive that relief, but is become an important national concern.”—What would he have said, had he known that the depopulation which shocked him was proceeding so rapidly as I have shewn; that no attention would be given to it; that the public burdens, instead of being lessened, would increase; and that he himself had laid the foundation of such an increase of them as would, in a few years, bring the nation to the brink of ruin?

The increase in the higher classes of houses has been for some time obvious to every one. It may be imagined, that this implies such an increase of people in the middle and higher ranks of life, as makes

It should be remembered here that the return which I have given in p. 9, &c. for 1761, was understood by Mr. Grenville to have been a return for 1766.

amends for the depopulation among the lowest ranks. But the truth is, that no such conclusion can be drawn. One of the principal causes of this increase has been that very evil which has destroyed the common people; or the increase of luxury. This, I think, has been demonstrated, by the account I have given of London\*. See page

The following circumstance may perhaps deserve some notice here.—By the new regulations of the window-tax in 1776, particular inducements were given to divide buildings deemed *single houses*, but holding *several families*, into houses having only one family in each; and this, as well as luxury, may have contributed to increase the number of houses without increasing the number of inhabitants.

For instance. By dividing a house having 30 windows, and containing *three families*, into *three houses* or tenements, having ten windows, and one family in each house, only 9s. *per annum* would have been saved before 1766; but since the alteration in the tax that year, 1l. 14s. *per annum* may be got by such a division.—In like manner. By dividing such a house into two houses, having one family in each, and 15 windows, 3s. *per annum* would have been *lost* before 1766; but now 15s. *per annum* may be *saved* by it.

N. B.—Before 1766, houses having from eight to eleven windows paid 1s. per window; and houses having more than eleven windows paid 1s. 6d. per window, besides 3s. for the house.—By the new regulations in 1766, besides the old duty of 3s. for every house, all houses

page 4. It must, however, be acknowledged, that in many of our towns, and particularly our manufacturing towns, there has been a great increase of people, as well as of houses; but it should be considered, that it has been derived from the depopulation of country parishes and villages, the inhabitants of which, by removing to these towns, and many of them thriving there, and living in better houses, have increased the number of such houses at the expence of meaner houses. This increase of people, therefore, in our towns has either quickened depopulation; or, if not, it must have been owing entirely to the increase of trade. From the accounts of the exports at the Custom-house it appears, that \* for some years before

houses having seven windows pay 3d. per window. Houses having 8, 9, &c. to 13 windows, pay respectively 6d.—8d.—10d. &c. to 1s. 4d. per window.—Houses having from 14 to 19 windows pay 3s. 6d. per window.—Houses having 20, 21, &c. to 24 windows, pay 1s. 7d.—1s. 8d. &c. to 1s. 11d.—Houses having above 24 windows, pay 2s. per window.

\* See *The Additional Observations on Civil Liberty*, page 113. The annual average of exports for four years ending in 1764, was 15,793,158*l.*—In 1773, the average for nine years had sunk to 14,814,074*l.* But the imports had increased from 10,110,870*l.* to 11,996,769*l.*—The

fore 1765 they were at the highest,\* and that they have since decreased. This decrease, however, has been more than compensated by the increase of our *home-consumption*, occasioned by a vast increase† of luxury; and this, though it has operated fatally among the body of the lower people, has, in one way, contributed to retard the progress of depopulation; I mean, by furnishing an increase of employment, and consequently of the means of subsistence, for our manufacturers and artizans. But though depopulation has been thus checked, yet it has proceeded rapidly; and if we ascribe one half

decay of foreign trade may farther be understood from hence. In 1764, the drawbacks on exportation amounted to 2.264,820*l.*—The average for ten years after 1764 was 1.843,494*l.*—but in 1776 they sunk to 1.544,300*l.*—In 1777, to 932,860*l.*—In 1778, to 868,600*l.*

† The following account will shew how great this increase has been.—The *net annual* amount of all the excise duties for two years, ending 1768, was 4.431,075*l.* For two years, ending in 1773, it was 4.712,265*l.*—For two years, ending in 1777, it was above FIVE MILLIONS, after deducting the new taxes for 1776 and 1777.—The great increase of our importations, while the exportations have decreased, as mentioned in the last note, is another certain proof of the increase of luxury; and has probably been the means of turning the balance of trade against us. See *Additional Observations on Civil Liberty*, p. 116, &c.

of

of the increase in the higher classes of houses to this cause (or a real increase of people) and the other half to luxury, as before explained, we shall, I think, reckon very moderately; and it will appear, that in eighteen years near 200,000 of our common people have been lost.

I will only observe farther, that since the Revolution, most of the causes of depopulation have prevailed so much as to render it an evil which could not but happen. The causes I mean are—the increase of our navy and army, and the constant supply of men necessary to keep them up—a devouring capital, too large for the body that supports it\*—the three long and destructive continental wars in which we have been involved—the migrations to our settlements abroad, and particularly to the East and West Indies—the engrossing of farms—the high price of provisions—but above all, the increase of luxury, and of our public taxes and debts.

I have given a particular account of these causes of depopulation in the Supplement to

PARIS cannot contain so much as a *fiftieth* part of the inhabitants of *France*. LONDON contains a *ninth* of the inhabitants of *England*; and consumes annually about 7,000 persons, who remove into it from the country every year, but without increasing it.

the



the *Observations on Reverſionary Payments*, page 371, third edition.—I will here only obſerve, that the depopulation they have produced is the more mortifying, becauſe it ſeems, in ſome degree, peculiar to this nation.—In FRANCE, (in the principality of *Dombes*, the dioceſe of *Vaiſon*, and the fix generalities of *Auvergne\**, *Lyon*, *Rouen*, *Burgogne*, *Provence*, and *Alençon*, containing 2152 pariſhes) the average of annual births before 1764 had increaſed in 60 years from 54,827 to 59,894, or in the proportion of 100 to 109.—The average for five years of annual births in the whole kingdom of *France*, (as mentioned in the note, page 15.) had been 928,918, in 1774, of which 479,649 were males, and 449,269 females.—The average of deaths, as mentioned in the ſame note, had been 780,040 for three years, ending in 1772. But Mr. MOHEAU has given the average for five years, ending in 1774†; and it was 793,931. The annual

\* See *Recherches ſur la Population*, printed at Paris in 1765, page 274, and page 19, &c. See alſo on this ſubject M. MOHEAU's *Recherches & Conſiderations ſur la Population de la France*, printed at Paris in 1778; where, in page 276, &c. the account of the increaſe of the generalities of *Auvergne*, *Lyón*, and *Rouen* is continued to 1774.

† MOHEAU's *Recherches*, &c. page 65.—The average of marriages was 192,180.

excess of the births above the deaths was, therefore, 134,987; or near a *seventh* of the Births; and this is probably an excess which in *France* more than counterbalances the destruction occasioned by emigration, war, and the sea-service.

The increase in SWEDEN and the kingdom of NAPLES has been distinctly mentioned in the note just referred to.

In the English colonies in NORTH AMERICA there has for many years been an increase scarcely ever before known among mankind.

Thus unhappily distinguished are we in this country. Nor will it appear wonderful, when we consider how unhappily we are distinguished by some of the worst causes of depopulation; and with what particular force they have been operating for the last *twenty* years. At present we are sinking under new incumbrances and difficulties. The most valuable of our dependencies are lost. Another foreign war is begun. Trade is declining; our strength is wasting; and at the same time, that load of debts which has pressed so heavily on our population, is increasing faster than ever.—Never, certainly, were the resources of a state so anticipated

icipated and mortgaged\*.—Never before did imprudence and extravagance bring a great kingdom into such peril.

“ Our late delusions (says Mr. HUME \*)  
 “ have much exceeded any thing known in  
 “ history, not even excepting those of the  
 “ Crusades.

\* The terms of the loan for the present year will throw some light on what is here said.—A 3 per cent. stock has been sold at 40 per cent. discount, to which has been annexed an Annuity of  $3\frac{1}{4}$  per cent. for 29 years, at ten years purchase, but really worth (when the 3 per cents. are at 40 per cent. discount)  $15\frac{1}{8}$  years purchase.—The public, therefore, besides subjecting itself to the necessity of paying at redemption 40l. more than it has received for every 100l. stock, has given a present premium on the short annuity of near 33 per cent. And even on these terms, (with the profits of a lottery added) only seven millions could be got, though above ten millions and a half (including 2,176,000 increase of navy debt in 1778) were wanted for defraying the necessary expences, exclusive of the usual vote of credit for a million.—These deficiencies must be made good; and at least eleven or twelve millions more borrowed at the beginning of the next year, for which, very probably, if the war continues and spreads, a higher interest and still higher premiums must be given.—The national debt is now considerably greater than it was in 1776, when Mr. Hume wrote the words quoted in the next page; and it is advancing fast towards two hundred millions: It may signify little how a nation, in such circumstances, borrows money; but I am mistaken if I have not (in the *Supplement* to the *Additional Observations on Civil Liberty*) proposed regulations

“Crusades. For there is no arithmetical  
 “demonstration that the road to the Holy  
 “Land is not the road to Paradise; as there  
 “is, that the endless increase of national  
 “debt is the direct road to national ruin.  
 “——So egregious, indeed, has been our  
 “folly, that we have even lost all title to  
 “compassion under the numberless calamities  
 “that are waiting us.”

tions by which the loan of this year might have been procured at an interest of 5 (or, at most, 5½) *per cent.* and consequently an expence of 100,000*l. per annum* for 29 years saved; which saving, properly applied, might have discharged, in 28 years, either the capital of *five millions* bearing *four per cent* interest created in 1777, or a *larger* capital in the *three per cents.*

\* See History of England, vol. 5th, page 475.

## P Q S T S C R I P T

*The Favour of a Friend has lately procured for me, from the Tax-Office, the following Particulars in the Returns for 1756 and 1759, mentioned in Page 24.*

	In 1756.	In 1759.
Houses charged having less than 10 windows	482,533	— 475,147
Houses charged having from 10 to 14 windows — — —	105,153	— 103,610
Houses charged having from 15 to 19 windows — — —	55,457	— 53,193
Houses charged having 20 windows or more	47,559	— 47,199
Total — — —	690,702	— 679,149

This account scarcely needs a comment. A comparison of it with the *returns* in page 9, &c. for 1761 and 1777, will shew distinctly, that *before* 1759, houses of all sorts were decreasing; but that afterwards an increase (produced by increased trade and

and luxury, as explained page 25, &c.) begun among the *higher* classes of houses, which soon became considerable; but was all along accompanied with a decrease much more considerable in those inferior classes of houses which constitute near *four fifths* of all the houses in the kingdom.

---

## A P P E N D I X.

**I**N the preceding Essay I have offered a good deal of evidence to prove that, while other countries are increasing, this country, in consequence of the causes of depopulation which have unhappily distinguished it, has for many years been decreasing. This is a fact so melancholy, that every person who loves this country must wish that the evidence for it could be fairly overthrown. Mr. Eden, in his fifth letter to Lord Carlisle, has made many objections to this evidence; and his means of information as well as abilities are such as entitle all that he says to particular attention.

My design in this Appendix is to give a brief account of his arguments; and, with all the respect due to him, to offer my reasons, for not being convinced by them.

In p. 10, &c. it has been shewn from the accounts in the tax-office, that between the years 1761 and 1777 the number of houses

## A P P E N D I X.

51

In the kingdom having less than eight windows had decreased 55,771. This evidence seems to be direct and full, and it is the evidence on which I have laid the principal stress. The objections which Mr. Eden has made to it, are the two following.

First, He observes, that the account in the tax-office of the number of cottages excused on account of poverty are uncertain and defective. To this I have, in page 23 &c. given an answer; which appears to me clear and decisive.

Secondly, He intimates a doubt whether the returns made of even the charged houses can be relied on; and the reason he assigns is the irregularity in the following returns. "The houses, he says, returned as *charged* "and *chargeable* in 1750 were 729,048, "and in 1756 only 690,702, but in 1759 "they were 704,544."\* But Mr. Eden has here fallen into an incorrectness of considerable consequence. The number for 1756 consists of the *charged* houses only. Adding, therefore, 25,000 for the *chargeable* or *uninhabited* houses; these three returns (with those for 1761 and 1777) will be as follows:

See the fifth letter to Lord Carlisle, page 65.

Charged



Charged and chargeable

houses in	—	—	—	1750—729,048*
				1756—715,702,
				1759—704,053
				1761—704,543
				1777—701,473

There is no irregularity in these returns, which gives them any appearance of incredibility. On the contrary they afford as strong a proof of progressive depopulation as actual surveys, can give. The decrease, which appears before 1759, must have been occasioned in part by the shocking havock, which had been made for many years among the lower people by the use of spirituous liquors, and the progress of which has been stated in the note, p. 20. After this year the number of the best sort of charged houses began to increase; but at the same time the houses excused, or paying only the 3s. duty, went on to decrease so fast as to over-balance that increase. The chief reason of this increase I have, in page 26, stated to be

\* In the Tax-office accounts this is called, “the total number of houses in the respective counties, *chargeable* with the duties on houses and windows.” And the number for 1756 is called, “the number of houses in England, &c. *charged* with the duties, &c.”

luxury;

luxury\*, and of this we have a distinct proof in the returns for London, where, though the increase of new buildings has been so great as to over-balance a decrease of 5,762 in the houses excused, yet the number of inhabitants, if we may judge from the bills of mortality, has diminished. But of this more will be said presently.

The decrease of cottages has for many years been an object of general observation. It is an effect which could not but arise from the inclosing of common fields, the engrossing of farms, the high price of provisions, the raising of rents, and that inequality in the division of property, which has lately prevailed among us more than ever.

I will just mention here the following facts.

In 1689 the houses in the kingdom called cottages, and having only *one* hearth, and which, therefore, I suppose, answer to the houses now denominated cottages, were — — — † 554,631  
The houses denominated cottages in 1777, were — ‡ 251,261

\* Promoted and accelerated by an influx of wealth, during this period, from the EAST-INDIES.

† See Dr. Davenant's works, vol. II, p. 203.

‡ See p. 10.

In 1686 the whole expence of maintaining the poor was — \*665,362*l*.

In 1778 this expence (exclusive of 137,656*l*. for county rates, &c.) amounted to — — †1,556,804*l*.

In 1777 no less than 7,360 houses, which had been brought into charge, were discharged by appeal on account of poverty.

These facts seem to me to indicate a growing distress among the lower people, which did not take place formerly. They also lead us to carry our views as high as the *Revolution* for the commencement of depopulation among us. In the preceding Essay I have given a particular account of the evidence which has determined me to believe this to be the truth; and it is against this evidence that Mr. Eden has chiefly directed his objections.

First. He is unwilling to allow Dr. Davenant's authority in this instance; and in opposition to it observes, that Dr. Halley (whose authority, he says, is at least equal to Dr. Davenant's) estimated the number of houses in 1691 to be 1,175,951. Mr. Eden,

\* See Dr. Davenant's works, vol. I*st*, p. 35.

† See Abstract of the returns made by the overseers of the poor, in pursuance of an act passed in the 16th year of his present majesty's reign.

may, perhaps, have good reasons for ascribing this estimate to Dr. Halley; but I wish he had said what they are. All I can find is, that it is given in a collection on *Trade and Husbandry* published by Mr. Houghton, in weekly numbers, in 1693‡. But it is not said from what authority it was taken, nor, in what year it was made; and it is given among other accounts, most of which are too vague and conjectural. Till, therefore, I am better informed, I must think that it deserves no particular regard. And as to Dr. Davenant, it is proper to observe, that on such a subject as this there can scarcely be an equal authority; that his account is derived from materials which might have

‡ See Houghton's *Husbandry and Trade improved*, vol. III, No. 26, for Saturday, Feb. 3, 1693.—In No. 24, Mr. Houghton has mentioned an assistance which he had received from Dr. Halley, and published a letter from him written ten years before, containing an account of a method of computing, within a million or two, the number of acres in all England. But Mr. Houghton has said nothing that implies he had received his account of the number of houses in England from Dr. Halley.—Dr. Davenant's account from the hearth-books was publish'd three years afterwards, in his *Treatise on Ways and Means*, and is frequently referred to in some of his subsequent treatises; but he never takes notice of Mr. Houghton's account, which, therefore, I suppose, was not much regarded.

furnished him with the particular information which he gives on this subject; and that in the writings which followed that in which he gives this account (and particularly in his Observations on the People of England, published in 1699) he frequently refers to it, and reasons upon it, as an information of importance in political arithmetic, about which there was no reason to doubt\*.

Secondly. It is farther objected by Mr. Eden, that Dr. Davenant meant to give the number of *families*, and not of *houses*. I have already in the note page 18, taken notice of this objection. He that will consider the table in page 6†, must see that in most places

\* “ The wealth of a whole people is a great matter  
“ to consider; but in time it may be compassed, espe-  
“ cially when there is such a footing to fix our reason-  
“ ings upon, as is the *certain* knowledge of the numbers  
“ of the people, which it is hoped some abler head will  
“ hereafter so improve as to make all points, relating to  
“ the strength and power of England, much clearer than  
“ they seem at present.” Davenant’s works, vol. 1st.  
page 373.—Of the hearth money, he says, in page 136,  
“ that it had given a view certain enough of the number  
“ of families in the kingdom, which was the very  
“ ground-work in political speculations.”—And that the  
“ accounts of it were fairly kept and stayed, and had  
“ been under exact management.”

† The numbers in this table are given from actual surveys. It cannot therefore be proper to call them, as Mr.

Eden

places there is very little difference between the number of *houses* and *families*; and, consequently, that, supposing Dr. Davenant to mean families, their number now in the kingdom must be far short of their number at the Revolution. But Dr. Davenant, at the head of the table which contains the particulars of this account†, calls it the number of *houses*. In reasoning upon it afterwards he generally does the same; and in his ‡ account of Mr. King's observations (which

Eden does, *estimate*, and to represent them as uncertain? Mr. Eden objects farther to this table, that due attention has not been given in it to the numbers in schools, docks, hospitals, and prisons.

This remark is wrong as far as it respects *schools*. As for *prisons, hospitals, and docks*, the numbers in them are little or nothing to the whole kingdom. In 1779 the number of persons confined in prisons and houses of correction including all debtors, felons, and petty offenders, was 4,375, according to an accurate account, which the public owes to the unexampled benevolence of Mr. Howard. See the state of the gaols, page 449. 6th. edit.

† See his works, vol. I. page 29.

‡ Mr. Eden quotes the following passage to prove that Dr. Davenant meant *families* and not *houses*. “ Though  
“ it appears from the books of hearth-money, that there  
“ are not above 1,300,000 *families* in England; and al-  
“ lowing six persons to a *house*, one with another, which  
“ is the common way of computing, not quite eight  
“ millions of people; and though (as likewise appears  
“ from the hearth-books) there are 500,000 poor fami-

(which he represents as more to be relied on than any thing that had been done in political arithmetic, and which appear indeed to have been the result of particular enquiry united to great sagacity) he makes the number of families to be 1,349,586; the number of persons to a family  $4\frac{1}{3}$ , and the number of people in the kingdom 5,500,000.—The truth is, that Dr. Davenant considered the number of houses and families as so nearly the same, that he did not think it ne-

cessary to distinguish between them. “lies in the nation, living in cottages, who contribute little to the common support yet, &c.” Dr. Davenant’s *Essay on Ways and Means*, published in 1695. (See his works, vol. I. p. 27.) It is evident that he makes use in this passage of round numbers without aiming at accuracy, or chusing to distinguish between houses and families. But afterwards, in the same tract, page 53, he speaks with more precision, and in a manner that demonstrates he meant *houses* and not *families*. “If,” says he, “111,215 houses in and about London, with no more ground than what they stand upon, are in rent one million and a half *per annum*, it is hardly possible but that the 1,208,000 houses in the country, with all the land about them, and all the benefits that attend land, must be in rent 13,500,000*l*.”—Dr. Davenant’s allowance of six to a family deserves no regard, for it is certainly wrong; and he was himself afterwards (as observed above) better instructed by Mr. King’s *Observations*, published in 1699 in an *Essay on the probable method of making the people gainers by the balance of trade*. See his works, vol. II. d, page 185, &c.

cessary

cessary, to be careful in distinguishing between them.

I have in page 18, &c. as a collateral evidence in this question, given an account of the decrease in the produce of the temporary and hereditary excise upon beer since the Revolution.—Mr. Eden objects to this,

First, That there was an alteration of the measure at the Revolution which diminished the produce of this excise, and also that a duty on coffee had formed a part of it which was then taken off. The alteration in the measure is mentioned by Dr. Davenant, (see his works, vol. I<sup>st</sup>, page 185, &c.) and its effect in diminishing the excise estimated at 20,000*l. per annum*. As for the duty on coffee, it was only 4*d.* a gallon\*, and therefore so trifling as not to deserve notice. Neither of these causes therefore can account for the decrease stated, in page 19th, and their effect has been counterbalanced by an exorbitant deduction of 70,000*l.* which I have made from the produce of this excise at the Revolution, on account of its including then a duty on low wines and spirits, which was taken from it in 1736. The average of the gross annual produce of this excise for

This duty is now three shillings per pound, and



three years ending in 1689 was 740,147*l.* of which the excise on beer alone produced 679,590\*. The difference is 60,550*l.* and consisted not only of duties on low wines and spirits, but also on mead, cyder, perry, chocolate, sherbet, and beer and cyder imported. Had, therefore, a deduction of only 40,000*l.* been made, I should probably have exceeded the truth, and the decrease would have appeared 30,000*l.* more than I have made it.

Mr. Eden has objected farther, that though the conclusion I have drawn is countenanced by a comparison of the produce of this excise at present with its produce at the Revolution, yet a different conclusion may be drawn by comparing it with the produce of the same excise at several periods since the Revolution. This is Mr. Eden's principal argument, and the following table will represent it in its greatest force †.

\* See Davenant's works, vol. Ilt, page 175.

† It must be remembered here, that this table gives the GROSS ANNUAL PRODUCE of the *hereditary and temporary* excise, with a deduction from it (on account of the duties on low wines and spirits) of 40,000*l.* till 1710; of 50,000*l.* for the two years ending at 1710, and of 70,000*l.* for the two years ending at 1736.

	£.
Three years ending at 1689—	709,147
Two years ending at — 1695—	438,573
* 1699—	381,886
1703—	473,799
1710—	449,666
1719—	509,370
1736—	515,400
† 1746—	495,749
1753—	527,091
1761—	575,286
For four years ending at 1768—	527,991
1774—	520,613
1778—	554,460

It may be observed, in this account, that during King William's wars the produce of this excise sunk greatly, that it rose at the subsequent peace, that it sunk again a little during Queen Ann's wars, and that ever since it has been rising except about the time when gin-drinking was most prevalent, but

I have taken the whole of this account from the Excise books, except the average for the four years ending in 1774 and 1778, which I have copied from Mr. Eden's fifth letter, page 67.

† The fall in 1745 and 1746 might also be owing to the shock given the nation by the rebellion in those years. This was a shock that was very near proving fatal to public credit

but that it has always kept far below what it was at the Revolution.

The quantity of *beer* brewed for sale at these different periods, and the number of *victuallers* in the kingdom correspond in a great measure to this account. The remarkable excess in all these instances, which took place at the Revolution, when joined to the evidence arising from Dr. *Davenant's* account of the number of *houses* or *families*, appeared to me to afford a very striking proof

credit. In order, at the beginning of 1746, to raise two millions on the land-tax, subscriptions (as had been usually practised in preceding years) had been opened in the city. But only half a million could be procured. In this distress the BANK was applied to, but such was the alarm which had taken place, that it could then scarcely support its own credit. In order, therefore, to enable it to lend a million to government, this sum in *Exchequer-bills* was converted into *Bank-stock*, and a call of 10 *per cent.* made on the proprietors as the payment for so much stock at *par*, one half to be paid in two months, and the Lady-day dividend to be reckoned a part of payment. But even on these advantageous terms the payments could not be easily made, and it became necessary to allow the proprietors farther time. In April the rebellion was crushed, and soon afterwards the panic occasioned by it ceased entirely and credit recovered its former vigour. The three *per cents.* in particular, which when the rebels were at *Derby* had been as low as 60, rose before August to 89, and continued between this price and 82 during the whole remainder of the war.

of an excess likewise of populousness at that period. Nor did I think it necessary to take notice of the sudden fall exhibited in the preceding table, because I thought there were such particular and obvious reasons for it, as rendered it a circumstance not necessary to be mentioned in this enquiry.— Since, however, Mr. Eden has laid great stress upon it, and even intimated that it affords an argument for an increased population, it is necessary I should enter into an explanation of it.

Every one knows, that the productiveness of taxes depends chiefly on the quantity of money in a kingdom. A smaller number of people will be able to pay more in taxes than a greater number, if they are better supplied with a circulating medium. During King William's wars, the trade of the kingdom sunk; all the public securities, which should have circulated as money, lost their credit; and the greatest part of the current coin was either miserably clipped, or sent away to pay armies and subsidies in foreign countries. In 1694 the bank was established; but for several years continued so weak, as to be incapable of giving the public much assistance by supplying it with a substitute for coin.—In these circumstances it was impossible that the people

should be able to make their usual payments. The taxes, therefore, fell near one half; and government became distressed to a degree of which we have now no conception\*.

In the subsequent peace trade revived, and began to bring in silver and gold. Those public securities which had been a dead stock, recovered activity, and the taxes of course became less deficient.——But the war in Queen Ann's time soon renewed the former distresses, and the taxes again sunk.

From the Accession to 1764 trade increased fast, and brought in a large favourable balance.

\* Tallies and malt tickets were in 1696 discounted at several rates from 25 to 50 *per cent.*——In 1694 and 1695 the annual import of brandy, which had been 1413,974 gallons, was only 54,081.——The whole revenue, which in 1689 had been 2,001,855*l.* was in 1693 only 1,570,318*l.* though new duties had been added which produced 466,203*l.* See Dr. Davenant's Works, Vol. I. p. 20.

The Bank Account (as delivered to the House of Commons on Dec. 4, 1696) stood as follows:

DEBTOR to sundry persons for sealed		£.	s.
bills standing out	— —	893,800	
For notes for running cash		764,196	: 10
To money borrowed in <i>Holland</i>	—	300,000	
To interest due on Bank-bills stand-			
ing out	— — —	17,876	
Balance	— — —	125,315	: 2
		<hr/> 2,101,187 : 12	

lance. Public credit acquired vigour, and foreigners threw in great sums into our funds. The BANK at the same time increased its emissions; and so powerfully did it co-operate with an increasing trade and flourishing credit, that in the two last wars, notwithstanding the treasure they carried out and the additional taxes they occasioned, none of that distress took place (except for a few months at the end of 1745, and the beginning of 1746), which had been felt in the two former wars.

Since 1764 there is reason to apprehend that an unhappy change has taken place, and that the balance of payment between us and the rest of the world has been turned against us, by the increase of luxury, our quarrels with

CREDITOR by tallies on several parliamentary securities	—	—	1,784,576 :
By half a year's deficiency of the fund of 100,000 <i>l</i> .	—	—	50,000
By cash, pawns, mortgages, &c.			266,610 : 16
			<hr/>
			2,101,187 : 12

In Queen *Ann's* war the *Bank* had got out of this state of infancy; but still it was so far from being very strong, that the apprehension of an attempt to invade *Scotland* in 1708, produced a run upon it that might have ruined it, had not Lord Godolphin, the Duke of Marlborough, and other great men, offered considerable sums to support it; and had not also the Directors increased the interest of their sealed bills from 3 to 6 *per cent.* and made a call upon the proprietors of 20 *per cent.*

the Colonies, and the payments due to foreigners from our funds. But the increase of our paper circulation has concealed this change, and counteracted its effects; and now so abundantly are we supplied from this source, that we find ourselves able to sustain a load of taxes, which at the beginning of this century would have at once overwhelmed us \*.——Still, however, and though much better supplied than ever with the means of paying taxes, we find that the hereditary and temporary excise produces near a *quarter* less than it did before the Revolution.—Others may think as they please; but I cannot see that this is fairly to be accounted for on any other supposition than that the common people, who chiefly pay this tax, are diminished in number.

Mr. Eden, as a farther objection to this evidence, chuses to compare the present produce of this tax, not with its average produce for *three* years, but for *fifteen* years

\* This account has been given more at large in the *Additional Observations on Civil Liberty*, Part III. Sect. I. p. 113, &c. It is natural to infer from it, the usefulness of banks of circulation; and they are, without doubt, attended with great temporary conveniencies; but they give a complexion rather florid than healthy; and, by subjecting a kingdom (as Dr. Davenant speaks) to *apoplectic* disorders, may prove in the end the greatest of evils.

before the Revolution; and from this comparison it appears that there is no considerable difference, the former average having been 554,000*l.* and the latter 520,000*l.* —But nothing can be justly inferred from such a comparison. The kingdom, in consequence of recovering tranquility after the distractions of the civil war, made a quick progress in all kinds of improvement. Between the *Restoration* and *Revolution*, an addition of 70,000 was made to the number of smaller houses in the kingdom. Ten millions and 2 half in bullion (an overflowing produced by foreign trade) was carried to the mint to be coined, and the current specie increased to eighteen millions and a half \*. —These, and several other par-

\* “ As to plate, it may be safely affirmed, that there  
 “ was more wrought for use in families from 1666 to—  
 “ 1688, than had been fabricated for 200 years before.  
 “ —As to inhabitants, such as are versed in political  
 “ arithmetic have sufficient grounds to believe that the  
 “ people of England were about 300,000 more in 1688,  
 “ than they were in 1665, notwithstanding the last great  
 “ plague.—As to the common people, there is no  
 “ country in the world where the inferior rank of men  
 “ were better clothed and fed, and more at their ease.—  
 “ —As to buildings, during that time, not only many  
 “ stately edifices have been erected, but farm-houses  
 “ have been kept up; and besides, from the books of  
 “ hearth-money, and for other reasons, it appears, that  
 “ of smaller persons, the number was in 1688, 100,000 more than in 1665.”



particulars of the same kind, are stated by Dr. Davenant, in his discourses on the revenue and trade of the kingdom, published in 1698.—With respect to this tax in particular, he shews that its produce, during this period, had been always on the increase; partly in consequence of an increase of people and of money; and partly in consequence of improvements in the methods of collecting it. When it was granted to Charles the 2d. as a compensation for the profits of the court of wards and tenures by knight-service, it was not under-

“ been about 70,000 new foundations laid, &c. &c.” Davenant’s Works, Vol. I. p. 370, &c. In p. 374, &c. this author computes that the stock of the kingdom was more than half doubled between 1666 and 1688. “ Not long ago, he says, (referring to King William’s war) we must have been impotent for the war, but that it has been all the while and is still supported by a stock formerly gathered, and not yet exhausted.”—How far he thought this stock diminished by Queen Ann’s war, appears from the following words in a report he made in 1711 to the commissioners for stating the public accounts:—“ It is plain to all who are not resolved to shut their eyes, that we have nine millions less in coin than we had in 1688.” Davenant’s Works, Vol. V. p. 451. This must have soon crippled the kingdom, had it depended entirely on its coin; but the BANK had then acquired some strength, and trade also, notwithstanding the war, was on the increase.

stood ;

stood; and the people, being then not habituated to taxes, paid it reluctantly. At first it was farmed, and a considerable part lost by improper management. But for some years before the Revolution, the kingdom had been reconciled to it, and the collection of it had been brought under more strict and regular management.—Dr. Davenant shews, that this likewise was the case with the tax upon hearths. When first granted to King Charles the II<sup>d</sup>. it produced no more than 100,000*l. per ann.*; but it grew from time to time, till at the Revolution it came to yield net 240,000*l. per ann.\**—In such instances, and, in general, in all cases where an increase or decrease takes place, it is evidently improper to argue from any averages for long terms.

I have observed in the preceding essay, that there is reason to believe, that even LONDON was more populous at the Revolution, than it is now. The number of houses in the bills of mortality, as given from the hearth-books by Sir William Petty in 1687; and in *London, Middlesex, and Westminster*, as given by Dr. Davenant in 1690; compared

\* See Dr. Davenant's Works, Vol. I. p. 209.

with the accounts now kept by the surveyors of the house duties, gives a direct and positive proof of this \*. And it is confirmed by a comparison of the annual average of burials within the bills of mortality, for *five* years before the Révolution, with the average for the same number of years at present. See the Note, p. 5.—Mr. Ederf has objected only to the last of these arguments; and, in order to overthrow it, he compares the annual average of burials for *fifteen* years before the Revolution (which was 21,657), with the annual average for *seventeen* years ending in 1778, which was 22,763.—Here

\* “The number of houses in London appears by the register to be 105,315; whereunto adding a part, or 10,531 as the least number of double families that can be supposed in London, the total of families will be 115,846.” *Essays on Political Arithmetic* by Sir William Petty, published in 1687; p. 74.—“By certificate from the hearth-office, I find the houses *within the bills of mortality* to be 105,315.” *Ibid*, p. 79.—This agrees with Dr. Davenant, who from the same hearth-office gives 111,215 as the number of houses in London, Westminster, and Middlesex, on Lady-day, 1690. See his Works, Vol. I. p. 39.—Mr. Maitland tells us, that he took, with incredible pains, the number of houses in London in 1737, and found them to be 95,968. He also then took an account of the omissions in the burials, which he found to be 3,038, including the burials in Marybone and Pancras parishes. See his History of London, Vol. II. p. 744.

a remark just made must be repeated. This is one of the cases in which averages for long terms prove nothing. LONDON, after the fire in 1666, rose from its ruins with great improvements, and increased very fast; and, at the beginning of the period for which Mr. Eden's average is taken, two of the principal parishes in Westminster, namely, St. James and St. Anne, were not included in the bills.—On the contrary, during the second period, LONDON appears to have been decreasing. For five years, at the beginning of it, or from 1762 to 1766, the annual average of burials was 25,084. For the five years ending in 1772, it was 22,950; and for five years, ending in 1778, it was 20,835.—It is, therefore, only the average at the end of these two periods, that furnishes any evidence in the present question.

It is again objected, that *Pancras*, and *Marybone*, two of the most populous parishes in London, are not included in the bills.—In answer to this, it is enough to say, that there were at the Revolution twelve \* other parishes omitted; and that these

\* These parishes were St. John Wapping, added to the bills in 1698.—St. Mary le Strand, added in 1726.—St. George Hanover-Square, Christ Church Spitalfields, St. George Ratcliffe-Highway, and St. George the Martyr, added in 1729.—St. Ann. *St. Ann. St. Ann.*

these omissions, together with the omissions of the burials among Dissenters, must, probably, have occasioned *then* much greater deficiencies in the bills than exist *now*. In these twelve parishes there were buried, in the years immediately succeeding those in which they were taken into the bills, 5000 annually. In *Pancras* and *Marybone*, the annual burials for ten years, ending in 1772, were 1041. See *Treatise on Reversionary Payments*, p. 204, 3d Edit.—It is, therefore, of little consequence in the present enquiry, that these two parishes are out of the bills. The increase of buildings has, by no means, been confined to *them*. It has extended itself to most of the principal parishes *within* the bills; and yet the number of burials is considerably lower than it was when this increase began. The increase, therefore, has been merely an increase of buildings, arising from luxury; and this has been distinctly exhibited to us in that part of London which lies within the walls, where, though the number of houses cannot be much less, the burials have sunk gradually from 3139 (the annual medium at the Revolution) to 1428, the annual medium for five years ending in 1779.

1730.—St. George, Bloomsbury, and St. John, Westminster, in 1731.—St. John, Southwark, and St. Luke, Old-Street, in 1733.—St. Matthew, Bethnal-Green, in 1746.

It has been farther observed, that London is healthier now than it was. See fifth Letter to Lord Carlisle, p. 61. This probably may have had some effect in diminishing the burials; but it could not produce a diminution of any consequence, compared with that which has taken place. London is not now, in this respect, very different from what it was seventeen years ago; and yet, even within this period, the burials have fallen near a fifth. The rate of mortality, or the value of lives in London, (that is, its healthiness) is determined with precision, by tables of observation formed from the proportions of the numbers dying at all ages. See *Observations on Reversionary Payments*, Chap. III. Essay IV.—But these tables, whether they are formed from the bills as they are *at present*, or as they were *fifty years ago*, will give the values of lives nearly the same; but yet very different from the values of lives determined, in the same method, from registers of mortality in small towns, and country parishes and villages. The truth seems to be, that though London must be healthier now, than it was when the inhabitants were more crowded together; yet the principal causes which shorten life in great towns, (namely, the irregular modes of living and the foulness of the air) have

ing continued much the same, the law according to which life wastes, and the values of lives in London, have not sensibly varied:

It is also objected, that the bills are very erroneous—but the observation just made, demonstrates that they are not erroneous in the degree which is often supposed. Were they so, the values of lives deduced from them would be continually varying, which is not the case. They are, indeed, *defective*; but in consequence of a *great decrease* of Dissenters, they are less so than they used to be.

The fluctuation of London from the RESTORATION to the present time, may, in some measure, be collected from the following table:

Annual medium of burials for five years ending in 1664, when, besides other missions, 17 parishes, including <i>Marybone</i> and <i>Pancras</i> , were omitted in the bills	—	—	—	17,019
Annual medium for 5 years ending at 1689, 14 parishes omitted				22,742
Annual medium for 5 years ending at 1698, or at the conclusion of King William's war, 13 parishes omitted	—	—	—	20,487
				Annual

Annual medium for 5 years, ending

in 1715—22,177

\* in 1725—26,512

Three parishes omitted in 1739—26,035

Marybone and Pancras

only omitted — in 1748—23,884

in 1760—19,839

in 1765—23,992

in 1770—22,688

in 1777—21,087

in 1779—20,743

I have

\* With this table, let the following account of the quantity of coals imported to London be compared.

Chaldrons.

Annual medium for 3 years, ending in 1715—382,629

in 1725—460,138

in 1739—469,786

in 1748—476,902

in 1760—500,343

in 1765—534,856

in 1770—621,477

in 1777—683,457

Single year 1778—637,744

It appears, from hence, that between 1760 and 1777, the consumption of coals in London increased so fast, as at last to exceed the consumption *fifty years* ago near one half, though the burials were then near 6000 *per ann.* more than they have been lately. It is remarkable, that this great increase in the consumption of coals, happened at the very period when from other evidence (the increase of buildings, increased produce of the taxes, &c.) it appears, that luxury became particularly prevalent in the



I have chosen to bring these particulars to view, because they may help to illustrate some of the preceding observations. Were we to judge from the splendid shew which the new buildings round London make, we could not avoid believing, that there never was a time when it was so populous. But splendour and refinement have never favoured population. The state in which mankind increase most, is that in which they lead simple lives, are most on an equality, and least acquainted with artificial wants. Luxury in Society renders it a rank soil, which favours the growth only of noxious plants and weeds.—In p. 29, I have mentioned this, among the other causes, which have produced the destruction which has

the nation.—The late improvements in agriculture, the cultivation of barren wastes, &c. have been mentioned to prove that our population has increased; but this is the same kind of argument with the increase of buildings and of the consumption of coals in London, for the increase of London.

It may deserve to be further mentioned here, that the increase of coaches has kept pace with the increase of the consumption of coals in London; for the annual medium of the duty of 1*l.* per wheel on carriages, for two years ending 1750, was 56,091*l.*—In 1761, the same medium was 62,513*l.*—In 1768, it was increased to 75,132*l.*—And in 1778, to 94,082*l.*

taken place among our people. But Mr. Eden seems to think, that none of these causes have any great effect; and, if he is right, a country may be growing populous, in which they all operate to a degree scarcely ever before known, in any country. It would be to little purpose to enter into a discussion of this subject. I will, therefore, only observe, that due attention has never been given to one of the causes I have mentioned; I mean, the very disproportionate size of our capital. Towns in general, and great towns in particular, do more towards obstructing the increase of mankind, than all plagues, famines, and wars; and they have been generally largest in the declining periods of states. I have often thought, with pity and surprise, of the zeal with which Sir William Petty, and after him Mr. Maitland, contended in opposition to some French writers for the superiority of London to Paris, or any other city in the world. They did not consider, that they were only maintaining that England had a greater evil in it than any other kingdom.

In offering these remarks, I have no other intention, than to contribute the little in my power to inform the nation of its true state.

state. I think this, in the present instance, of particular importance; for if, indeed, there has been such a progressive decrease in the numbers of our people as the facts on which I have insisted seem to prove, the worst internal evils are operating among us; and all possible means ought to be employed to remove them.

I hope I shall not do wrong, if, with views of the same kind, I take this opportunity to mention a few more particulars, in which my ideas of our situation differ from Mr. Eden's.

He is unwilling to allow that we have any one mark of decay upon us. The *loss of trade*, and *diminished resources*, as well as a *decrease of population*, he enumerates among the *chimeras* which haunt the joyless imaginations of *some speculative men among us*.

— I shall think it strange if, after perusing the foregoing remarks, any one can think this a censure justly applicable to those who think our population has declined. That our *trade* also has declined, can scarcely be doubted, by those who will recollect, that we have lost the *Mediterranean*, the *African*, the *Spanish*, a considerable part of the *Irish*, and, above all, the *North American* trade.

Mr.

I must add, that the *Newfoundland* fishery in particular (our great nursery of seamen, and the very trade which we have endeavoured to extend by destroying the *New-England* fishery) is so much diminished, as to be in the way to total and irreparable ruin.

Mr. Eden's chief argument for the prosperous state of our trade, is taken from the productiveness of the Customs for the last year. The truth is, that the annual payments into the Exchequer from the Customs, which, for five years before 1776, were 2,521,768*l.* had fallen in 1776 to 2,460,402*l.* in 1777 to 2,199,105*l.* and in 1778 to 2,131,458; but that, in 1779, they had risen to 2,502,273*l.* The causes of the advance in the last year were, the addition of 5 *per cent.* to all the customs, a new tax upon wines in 1778, an extraordinary importation of Portugal wines in 1779, and particularly, the captures of our privateers, and the importation from the northern countries of naval stores, which, when imported from the colonies, lessened the revenue by bounties, but now increase it by the payment of high duties. The last of these causes, though it helps the revenue, has plainly the most pernicious operation; and, in general, it may be observed, that the customs being drawn from our importations, their most

flourishing state is consistent with a state of public affairs the most threatening.—During the last peace, the annual produce of the customs increased near *half a million*; but this increase has been the effect of a most unfavourable change in the state of our trade; a change, which, since the commencement of our disputes with the colonies, has been growing every year more and more conspicuous and alarming. To speak more plainly; while luxury has been keeping up our importations, and increasing the revenue, our exportations have been decreasing to such a degree, as to make our trade an evil, which supplies artificial wants, and feeds vice and extravagance at the expence of the treasure and strength of the kingdom. A proper attention to the following table will illustrate and prove these assertions;

Annual average of	Imports.	Exports.	Excess.
in 1738 and 1739 —	7,034,100	10,892,430	3,258,264
1747 and 1748 —	7,626,551	11,896,741	4,270,159
1756 and 1757 —	8,627,160	12,977,962	4,370,502
1761 and 1762 —	9,267,069	15,250,000	6,443,000
1770 and 1771 —	12,519,466	15,713,899	3,194,434
1774 and 1775 —	13,412,330	15,559,350	2,147,320
1776 —	11,696,754	13,729,731	2,032,977
1777 —	11,841,577	12,653,363	0,811,786

Of the imports and exports in 1778 and 1779, I know no more than what Mr. Eden has told the public, “ that in January last

the accounts of them were not adjusted; but that there was good reason to believe that their average might be safely estimated by the account for 1777." Fifth: Letter to Lord Carlisle, p. 25.

There are several melancholy truths which must force themselves on the reflection of those, who will compare the latter part of this table with the former part; but my present views allow me only to point out the demonstration it affords of the deplorable effects of this war. It appears, that both our exportations and importations have been diminished; but the former so much more than the latter, as to produce a *certainty* that we are now carrying on a losing trade. It is universally known, that the Custom-House entries give the importations *less*, and the exportations *greater*, than they are. The single article of smuggled tea (amounting, according to the estimate mentioned by Mr. Eden \*, to a million *per annum*) when added to the imports, will raise them above the exports. How great then would their excess be, were all other smuggled articles added?—Nothing can be more pernicious, than such a state of trade to a kingdom which has such a debt to support as we have, and a tribute of about a

million and a half *per annum* to pay to foreigners.—What renders this a consideration yet more mortifying is, that it appears from the preceding table, that during the wars which begun in 1740 and 1755, our trade went on uniformly increasing; and that at the end of the last war in particular, it was risen to its highest pitch, and must have brought in a very large favourable balance, which contributed to replace the treasure carried out, kept money at a moderate interest, and enabled government to prosecute the war with vigour, and to finish it with dignity and honour. The reverse, in every respect, is true of the *present* war. It appears, that the first approaches of it have operated on our trade like the grasp of death; and that now, instead of bringing in, as our trade used to do, a constant supply of treasure, in return for our manufactures, it is continually carrying out our treasure, and uniting with the demands of foreigners from our funds, and the expence of armies in distant countries, in draining and impoverishing us \*.

\* Mr. Eden, in his Fifth Letter to Lord Carlisle, p. 24, has acknowledged, that our export trade has suffered a great diminution; and he seems to think this an effect which could not but arise from the present war. But why, in our two former wars, did just the contrary effect take place?

It will be asked, how it comes to pass, that, a state of affairs so detrimental, is not more felt in a diminution of the revenue; in an unfavourable course of foreign exchanges; and in a scarcity of cash, attended with difficulties in raising money by public loans.—The answer to this enquiry is obvious. Distress has not yet forced us to any great retrenchment of luxury; and the exertions of the war, the profits of contracts, and the success of our cruisers, have enriched many individuals, and occasioned an extraordinary expenditure, which has kept up the revenue. Remittances of balances due to our merchants withdrawing from trade; the sale of French sugars, and other prize goods abroad; and the subscriptions of foreigners to our loans, have prevented the course of exchange from becoming unfavourable. The high interest given by government for money, draws all that can be collected of it from trade, and land and private securities. But above all; our paper credit supplying us with the most \*

\* In the course of the year, from Lady-day 1780 to Lady-day 1781, TWENTY-FIVE MILLIONS AND A HALF, consisting of the loan, the taxes, the lottery, and the vote of credit, will be paid into the *Exchequer*. This, though a sum which, *in coin*, could be conveyed to the *Exchequer* only in carts, will be taken thither in pocket-books.



convenient kind of money, we can spare our coin, which is now become an incumbrance, generally avoided, and of use only to make<sup>d</sup> up odd sums, and to carry on small traffic.

But to proceed to some observations of a different nature.

The last war was attended with an expence which far outwent the experience of all former wars; but it produced an increase of commerce and of territory, which raised the kingdom to a situation of dignity and eminence which astonished *Europe*. The effect of the present war on the dignity of the kingdom, and the extent of its territories, I leave to the sorrowful reflexion of the reader. My present purpose is only to contrast, in a few particulars, the *expence* of it with the expence of the last war.

At the end of 1762 (the last and most expensive year of the last war) the navy-debt, including transport service, was 5.929,124*l.* and the increase of it within the year, 2.157,148*l.*—At the end of 1775<sup>d</sup> the navy-debt was 8.357,877. The increase of it within the year was 3.178,877; and its increase in the present year will be near four millions and a half\*.

\* See Note A at the end.

In 1762 the extraordinaries of the army amounted to 3.080,000*l.*—In 1779, they amounted to 3.418,000*l.* \*

In 1762, the public borrowed TWELVE MILLIONS at an interest of FOUR AND A HALF *per cent.* †.—In the present year (1780) the public has borrowed TWELVE MILLIONS, but at an interest of SIX *per cent.*

The whole expence, ordinary and extraordinary, of 1762, was TWENTY MILLIONS AND A HALF ‡.—The whole expence of

\* These extraordinaries, from Christmas 1761, to Feb. 19, 1763, that is, for a year and 55 days, were 3.540,005*l.* including the vote of credit. Deduct 400,000*l.* for 55 days, and the remainder, or 3.080,000*l.* will be the extraordinaries for 1762. See Public Accounts of Services and Grants, by Sir CHARLES WHITEWORTH, p. 68.

A million was granted in 1762 (and also in the preceding year) towards paying for bread, forage, &c. for the combined army under Prince FERDINAND. But this, if I am not mistaken, was a grant or allowance for a service to be performed in the year in which the grant was made and provided for in the supplies of that year. It cannot, therefore, be reckoned an *extraordinary*, which is an exceeding of grants for specific services; or a debt contracted withut the consent of parliament, and provided for in the supplies of some subsequent year.

† See Note B.

‡ See Note C. In these sums is included the deficiencies of the new taxes, and of the land and malt-tax, which, in 1762, amounted to 393,56*l.*; but in 1780 to near a million.

this year will be TWENTY-FOUR MILLIONS AND A HALF.

The unfunded debt at the end of the last war was FIFTEEN MILLIONS AND HALF\*.—The unfunded debt at Christmas next will be TWENTY-TWO MILLIONS AND A HALF.

The last war increased the national debt near SEVENTY-ONE MILLIONS AND A HALF†.—The present war has already made a further addition to it of SIXTY-FIVE MILLIONS; and at Christmas next will make it up nearly to a HUNDRED AND NINETY-SEVEN MILLIONS.

It should be remembered, that this war is but *beginning*; that it will probably last for *years*, as Mr. Eden intimates; and that the more years it continues, the greater the expence of every year will become. To what then is the expence of it likely to grow; and HOW LONG SHALL WE BE ABLE TO BEAR IT? This very dark prospect will be rendered darker, if we consider how much we were loaded before the war begun, and that we are entering into it with almost all the burdens of former wars upon us.

\* See Note D.

† See Additional Observations on Civil Liberty, Part III. Sect. II. p. 147. See also Note E.

It is often said, that the great men in opposition want to force themselves into power. But it is scarcely possible they should be so foolish.—Involved in a most expensive and hazardous contest with two of the first powers in *Europe*—surrounding nations *hostile* to us, in a degree which leaves us not a *friend*, or even a *well-wisher* \* among them—a considerable part of our strength torn from us, and converted against us—our resources mortgaged beyond the hope or possibility of redemption—a debasing and wasteful luxury destroying public virtue; and producing a dissipation and venality in *private* life, and an extravagance in the expenditure of *public* money, which were † never equalled—and, at the same time, a monstrous debt pressing us, and increasing rapidly, without any other support than a frail credit, which the first disaster or panic may

\* “ The mother country now rises to offensive war against all these combined powers; not only without an ally, but almost without a *well-wisher*, from the extraordinary jealousy her greatness had inspired.” See An Account of some Particulars relative to the meeting at York, on Thursday the 30th of Dec. 1779. By Leonard Smelt, Esq;

† See a striking representation of this extravagance in a pamphlet lately published, and entitled, Facts addressed to Landholders, stockholders, merchants, farmers, manufacturers, &c.

break. — In SUCH CIRCUMSTANCES, wonderful must be that ambition which can render the management of our affairs an object of contention. — No enemy of our present ministers can wish them a greater punishment, than their *continuance* in power to conduct the war a few years, must prove. — Mr. Eden, indeed, thinks they may succeed, and are still able to extricate us. At a juncture of unparalleled embarrassment and danger, he has undertaken to give us comfort. He exhorts us, taking things as the authors of our distresses have made them, to prosecute the war with vigour, assuring us that we have not upon us any symptoms of decay which should discourage us; that we can bear much more, and have still sufficient resources left \*. — Entertaining other apprehensions, I have taken another course. The difference

\* In enumerating these resources, it is a little singular, that Mr. Eden should propose *one* (mortgaging the peace revenue) to which we cannot have recourse, without the dissolution of all government; and, at the same time, express himself doubtfully about *another* (abolishing *useless* places and pensions, &c.) to which the general expectation of the kingdom is directed; a resource with which our enemies are making war against us, in a manner that threatens us more than all their armies and navies; a resource which, while it bore a part of the expence of the war, would help to secure our liberties, and to *restore* the constitution.

between us is great; but there is one circumstance attending it, which, if I have been mislaid, will give me some comfort.—My representations will not be much regarded; or if they should, they can do harm only by putting the nation too much on its guard, and leading it to measures for recovering peace, and preserving its existence, which the necessity of its affairs does *not* require.—On the contrary, Mr. Eden's weight in the state and his abilities, command attention; and the counsel he gives will be followed. Should it, therefore, happen that he is wrong, and that our situation is perilous in the degree I have represented, he has been urging us towards a precipice, and the consequences may prove fatal.—In this respect, we are like two persons who observe a friend heavily burdened plunging into a deep water, one of whom, believing that he is not in a condition to combat danger, calls upon him to come back: and the other, believing the contrary, advises him to go on. If he takes the former advice, he will, at worst, be only over-cautious. But if he takes the latter advice, and should find himself deceived, he will lose his life.

After all. Did I apprehend that we were in a situation which admitted of no retreat, I should, however I might lament the

misconduct which has brought us to it, think myself bound to be silent. But our circumstances are not, I hope, so desperate. A retreat is, probably, still practicable by the same measure which would *certainly* have saved us not long ago—by withdrawing from that country where all our troubles have originated; and yielding to the colonies that blessing, which we are employing our armies to force from them, but which every country values above all blessings, and the loss of which we ourselves are now deprecating as the greatest calamity that can be the consequence of our present difficulties.

### ACCOUNTS referred to in the preceding APPENDIX.

(A) *Calculation of the Increase of the Navy Debt in 1780 and of its probable Amount at the end of the year.*

FROM accounts laid before the House of Commons, it appears, that on the 30th of Sept. 1779, the navy-debt was 7,262,415*l.*; and on the 31st of December following, 8,357,877*l.* It increased, therefore, in three months, 1,095,462*l.*; or at the rate of 4,381,848*l.* in a year. From this increase, deduct a *million and a half* ordered to be paid off, and included in the grants for this year. The remainder (or 2,881,848*l.*) added to 8,357,877*l.* will give 11,239,725*l.* the amount of the navy-debt at Christmas next; supposing it to increase

this year as it did in the last quarter of the last year. But the probability is, that it will increase faster; because last year there were only 70,000 seamen voted for the navy; whereas this year there are 85,000 voted. It may deserve to be farther mentioned, that in 1778 the navy-debt increased 2,175,427*l.*; and in 1779, 3,178,877*l.* As, therefore, an addition of 15,000 seamen and marines has been ordered this year, it must be moderate to reckon the increase of the year at the sum here stated.

(B) *Calculation of the different Rates of Interest at which Government borrowed Twelve Millions in 1762 and 1780.*

In 1762 the public gave for TWELVE MILLIONS in money,

Put, Twelve millions three per cent. stock	£.
worth, reckoning interest at $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. or	
the 3 per cents at 66 $\frac{2}{3}$ . . . . .	8,000,000
2. A short annuity of 120,000 <i>l.</i> for 19	
years, worth, at the same rate of interest,	
12 $\frac{2}{3}$ years purchase . . . . .	1,512,000
3. A long annuity for 98 years of 120,000 <i>l.</i>	
worth, at the same rate of interest, 21 $\frac{1}{6}$ ,	
years purchase . . . . .	2,628,000
4. Commencement of interest before the	
completion of payment, and discount	
(amounting to 46,539 <i>l.</i> ) for prompt pay-	
ment . . . . .	200,000
	12,340,000

N. B. This loan was settled in Dec. 1761, and the interest upon it began from Jan. 5th following. The value of this stock and the premiums annexed, at 5 per cent. is 11,219,000*l.* or 6 $\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. less than the money paid for them.



In 1780 the public has given for TWELVE MILLIONS in money,

1. Twelve millions 4 <i>per cent.</i> stock, worth, reckoning interest at 6 <i>per cent.</i>	—	8.000,000
2. A long annuity for 80 years of 217,500 <i>l.</i> worth, reckoning interest at 6 <i>per cent.</i>		
16½ years purchase, or	—	3.588,750
* See <i>Smollett's Tables</i> , or Table II. at the end of the <i>Treatise on Reversionary Payments</i> .		
3. Commencement of interest before payment, discounts for prompt payment, and profits of a lottery	—	450,000
Total	—	12.038,750

N. B. This loan was settled in March 1780, but the interest upon it began from Jan. 5th preceding. The value of this stock, and the premiums annexed, is, at 5 *per cent.* 14.313,000*l.* or 19½ *per cent.* more than the money paid, besides a larger profit at redemption.

(C) *Comparison of the whole Expence of 1762, with the whole Expence of 1780.*

Supplies in 1762, including 1.500.000 <i>l.</i> old exchequer bills, vote of credit for 1761, and the new vote for 1762.—See Public Accounts of Services and Grants, by Sir Charles Whitworth	—	18,525,046
Add the increase of navy-debt within the year, beyond the debt discharged *		322,122
Add the value of the premium given to the holders of twelve millions. See last note		4.140,000
		23,087,169
Deduct old Exchequer bills renewed, and the vote of credit for 1761	—	2.500,000
Remains the expence of the year	—	20.587,169
* Navy-debt on the 31st of Dec. 1762		
	—	5.929,124
Ditto, Dec. 1761	—	5.607,002
Difference	—	£. 322,122
		Supplies

Supplies in 1786, exclusive of the vote of credit for 1779	—	—	19,678,250
Add vote of credit for 1780	—	—	1,000,000
Add the increase of navy-debt beyond 1,500,000 <i>l.</i> included in the supplies. See note (A)	—	—	2,881,848
did the value (at 5 per cent.) of the premium given to the lenders of twelve millions. See note (E)	—	—	4,263,000
			<hr/> 27,823,098
Deduct Exchequer bills renewed	—		3,400,000
			<hr/>
Remains expence of the year, exclusive of the interest of the public debts	—		24,423,098

(D) *Comparison of the Unfunded Debt at the end of the last war, with the Unfunded Debt at the end of the present year; supposing the war not to be continued beyond it.*

Navy-debt at Christmas, 1780. See note (A)	11,239,725
Exchequer bills	—
	<hr/> 3,400,000
Extraordinaries of the army, reckoned not to exceed those in 1779	—
	<hr/> 3,418,000
Extraordinaries of the ordnance, reckoned likewise not to exceed those in 1779	591,000
Anticipation of the sinking fund	—
	<hr/> 500,000
Calling home troops †, and many expences which cannot immediately cease with the operations of war	—
	<hr/> 3,500,000
Total of unfunded debt at Christmas next	22,648,725
Unfunded debt at the end of the last war	15,639,793
See Additional Observations on Civil Liberty, p. 445.	

\* This was the amount of these supplies, as they were stated lately by Lord North in opening the budget.

† This is the sum which was borrowed in 1763 for discharging these expences; and it is included in the unfunded debt at the end of the last war, as here stated. The preliminaries of the last peace were signed at Paris, Nov. 3, 1762.—The navy in 1763 consisted of 14,000 sailors more; and the army in British pay (for near a third of the year) of 82,000 men, more than the ordinary peace establishment.

(E) *Calculation of the amount of the National Debt, supposing the war not to be continued beyond the present year.*

Amount of the national debt in 1775, exclusive of the unfunded debt.—See Additional Observations on Civil Liberty, Part III.

Sect. II. — — — 132,343,051

Added in 1776, 1777, 1778 and 1779 — 26,487,500

See Facts addressed to the Landholders, &c.

Chap. II.

Four per cent. stock, created in 1780 \* — 12,000,000

Long annuity 1780 of 217,500*l.* for 80 years,

which, though sold to the subscribers to

the loan in 1780, at 16½ years purchase, is

worth, when money is at 5 per cent. 19½

years purchase — — —

4,263,000

Unfunded debt. See last Note —

22,657,725

---

197,751,276

\* For this stock only *eight millions* were received (See note B) ; but the public is bound to return for it *twelve millions*. Such are our methods of borrowing.

THE  
GENERAL INTRODUCTION  
AND  
SUPPLEMENT  
TO

The TWO TRACTS ON CIVIL LIBERTY,  
the WAR with AMERICA, and the  
FINANCES of the KINGDOM.

---

By RICHARD PRICE, D.D. F.R.S.

---

L O N D O N

Printed for T. CADELL, in the STRAND  
MDCCLXXVIII.



---

## GENERAL INTRODUCTION

THE first of the following tracts was published in the beginning of the year 1776; and the second in the beginning of last year. They are now offered to the public in one volume, with corrections and additions. All the calculations, in the *Appendix* to the first tract, have been transferred to the *second* and *fourth* sections, in the third part of the second tract.

The section on PUBLIC LOANS, in the second tract, has been revised with care; and a *supplement* to it, containing additional proposals and some necessary explanations, has been given at the end of the whole.—This is a subject to which I have applied (perhaps too unprofitably) much of my attention. I have now done with it; and the whole is referred to the candid examination of those who may be better informed, hoping for their indulgence should they find that, in any instance, I have been mistaken. I have not meant, in any thing I have said on this subject, to censure any persons. That accumulation of artificial debt which I have pointed out, and by which the danger of the kingdom from its growing burdens

has been so needlessly increased, has, I doubt not, been the effect of inattention in our ministers; and the scheme, by which the loan of last year has been procured, gives reason to hope that better plans of borrowing will be adopted for the future.

The principal design of the first part of the second tract was (as I have observed in the introduction to it) to remove the misapprehensions of my sentiments on CIVIL LIBERTY AND GOVERNMENT into which some had fallen. It gives me concern to find that it has not answered that end in the degree I wished. I am still charged with maintaining opinions which tend to subvert all civil authority. I paid little regard to this charge, while it was confined to the advocates for the principles which have produced the present war; but as it seems lately to have been given the public from the authority of a writer of the first character, (a) it is impossible I should not be impressed by it, and I find myself under a necessity of taking farther notice of it.

There are two accounts, directly opposite to one another, which have been given of the origin of civil government. One of them is, that "civil government is an expedient contrived by

(a) See Mr. *Burke's* Letter to the Sheriffs of *Bristol*, page 53, 54.

“human prudence for gaining security against  
 “oppression; and that, consequently, the power  
 “of civil governors is a delegation or trust from  
 “the people for accomplishing this end?”

The other account is, that “civil government  
 is an ordinance of the Deity, by which the  
 body of mankind are given up to the will of a  
 “few; and, consequently, that it is a trust from  
 “the Deity, in the exercise of which civil go-  
 “vernors are accountable only to him.”

The question “which of these accounts we ought  
 “to receive,” is important in the highest degree.  
 There is no question which more deeply affects  
 the happiness and dignity of man as a citi-  
 zen of this world.—If the former account is  
 right, the people (that is, the body of inde-  
 pendent agents), in every community are their  
 own legislators. All civil authority is properly  
*their* authority. Civil governors are only public  
*servants*; and their power, being *delegated*, is by  
 its nature *limited*.—On the contrary. If the lat-  
 ter account is right, the people have nothing to  
 do with their own government. They are placed  
 by their maker in the situation of cattle on a  
~~own~~ estate, which the owner has a right to dispose of  
 as he pleases. Civil Governors are a body of  
*masters*; and their power is a commission from  
 Heaven held by divine right, and unbounded in  
 its extent.



I have espoused, with some zeal, the first of these accounts; and in the following tracts, endeavoured to explain and defend it. And this is all I have done to give countenance to the charge I have mentioned.—Even the masterly writer who, after a croud of writers infinitely his inferiors, seems to have taken up this accusation against me, often expresses himself as if he had adopted the same idea of government (*a*). Such indeed is my opinion of his good sense, and such has been the zeal which he has discovered for the rights of mankind, that I think it scarcely possible his ideas and mine on this subject should be very different. His language, however, sometimes puzzles me; and, particularly, when he intimates that government is an institution of divine authority; (*b*) when he scouts all discussions of the nature of civil liberty, the foundation of civil rights, and the principles of free government; and when he asserts the *competence* of our legislature to revive the *High-Commission Court* and *Star-Chamber*, and its **BOUNDLESS**

**AUTHO-**

(*a*) “ To follow, not to force the public inclination; to give a direction, a form, a technical dress and a specific sanction to the general sense of the community, is the true end of legislature. When it goes beyond this, its authority will be precarious, let its rights be what they will.” Letter to the Sheriffs of Bristol, p. 49.

(*b*) Ibid. p. 55. Thoughts on the causes of the present discontents, p. 67. “ Government certainly, is an institution

AUTHORITY not only over the people of *Britain*, but over distant communities who have no voice in it.

But

“ of divine authority ; though its *forms* and the *persons* who administer it, all originate from the people.” It is probable that Mr. *Burke* means only that government is a divine institution, in the same sense in which any other expedient of human prudence for gaining protection against injury, may be called a Divine institution. All that we owe *immediately* to our own foresight and industry, must *ultimately* be ascribed to God the giver of all our powers, and the cause of all causes. It is in this sense that St. Paul in Rom. xiii. 1, 2. calls civil magistracy the *ordnance of God*, and says that *there is no power but of God*. If any one wants to be convinced of this, he should read the excellent bishop Hoadly’s Sermon entitled *The Measures of Submission to the civil Magistrate*, and the defences of it.

It is further probable, that when Mr. *Burke* asserts the *omnipotence* of Parliaments, or their *competence* to establish any oppressions (Letter, p. 46, 49) he means mere *power* abstracted from *right*, or the same sort of *power* and *competence* that trustees have to betray their trust, or that armed ruffians have to rob and murder. Nor should I doubt whether this is his meaning, were it not for the passage I have quoted from him in the last page, the latter part of which seems to imply, that a legislature may contradict its *end*, and yet retain its *rights*.—Some of the justest remarks on this subject may be found in the Earl of Abingdon’s thoughts on Mr. *Burke*’s letter, a pamphlet which (on account of the excellent public principles it maintains, and the spirit of liberty it breathes, as well as the rank of the writer) must give to every friend to the true interests of this country particular pleasure.

But whatever may be Mr. BURKE's sentiments on this subject, he cannot possibly think of the

In p. 46, Mr. *Burke* says, that " if there is one man in the world more zealous than another for the supremacy of parliament, and the rights of this imperial crown, it is himself; though many may be more knowing in the extent and the foundation of these rights." He adds, that " he has constantly declined such disquisitions, not being qualified for the chair of a professor in metaphysics, and not chusing to put the solid interests of the kingdom on speculative grounds."——*The less knowledge, the more zeal*, is a maxim which experience has dreadfully verified in religion. But he that, in the present case, should apply this maxim to Mr. *Burke*, would, whatever he may say of himself, greatly injure him. Though he chuses to decry enquiries into the nature of liberty, there are, I am persuaded, few in the world whose zeal for it is more united to extensive knowledge and an exalted understanding.——He calls it, p. 55. " the vital spring and energy of a state, and a blessing of the first order." He cannot, therefore, think that too much pains may be taken to UNDERSTAND it. He must know, that nothing but usurpation and error can suffer by enquiry and discussion.

Mr. WILKES, in an excellent speech which he lately made in moving for the repeal of the declaratory law, observed, that this law was a *compromise* to which the great men, under whose administration it was passed, were forced in order to obtain the repeal of the *Stamp-act*. ' I think so highly of that administration and of the service it did the public, that I have little doubt of the truth of this observation. But, at the same time, I cannot help wishing Mr. *Burke* had given no reason for doubt by defending the *principle* of that act; *principle* which, unquestionably, he and his friends would *er* have acted upon; but which others have since acted upon, with a violence which has brought us to the brink of ruin.

former

former account of government that "it is a  
 "speculation which destroys all authority."—Both  
 accounts establish an authority. The difference  
 is, that one derives it from the *people*, and makes  
 it a *limited* authority; and the other derives it  
 from *Heaven*; and makes it *unlimited*.—I have  
 repeatedly declared my admiration of such a  
 constitution of government as our own would be,  
 were the House of Commons a fair representa-  
 tion of the kingdom, and under no undue influ-  
 ence.—The sum of all I have meant to main-  
 tain is, "that LEGITIMATE GOVERNMENT, as  
 "opposed to OPPRESSION and TYRANNY, con-  
 "sists in the dominion of equal laws made with  
 "common consent, or of men over *themselves*;  
 "and not in the dominion of communities over  
 "communities, or of any men over other men."  
 Introduction to the second Tract, p. 9.—How  
 then can it be pretended, that I have aimed at  
 destroying all authority? Does our own consti-  
 tution destroy all authority? Is the authority of  
 equal laws made with common consent no autho-  
 rity? Must there be no government in a state  
 that governs itself? Or, must an institution, con-  
 trived by the united counsels of the members of  
 a community, for restraining licentiousness and  
 gaining security against injury and violence, en-  
 courage licentiousness, and give to every one a  
 power to commit what outrages he pleases?

The Archbishop of York, (in a sermon preached before the society for propagating the gospel in foreign parts, Feb. 21, 1777,) has taken notice of some loose opinions, as he calls them, which have been lately current on civil liberty; some who mean delinquency having given accounts of it “by which every man’s humour is made to be the rule of his obedience, all the bad passions are let loose, and those dear interests abandoned to outrage for the protection of which we trust in law,” 4to edit. p. 15 and 16. It is not difficult to guess at one of the delinquents intended in these words. In opposition to the horrid sentiments of liberty which they describe, but which in reality no man in his senses ever entertained, the Archbishop defines it to be simply, the supremacy of law, or GOVERNMENT by LAW, without adding to *law*, as I had done, the words *equal* and *made with common consent*; (a) and without opposing a GOVERNMENT by LAW to a GOVERNMENT BY MAN, as others had done.—Ac-

(a) In p. 19. he calls liberty “a freedom from all restraints except such as established law imposes for the good of the community.” But this addition can make no difference of any consequence, as long as it is not insisted *when* the power is lodged of judging what laws are for the good of the community. In countries where the law is the will of absolute princes, the end professed is always the good of the community

cording

according to him, therefore, the supremacy of law must be liberty, whatever the law is, or whoever makes it.—In despotic countries government by law is the same with government by the will of one man, which HOOKER has called *the misery of all men*; but, according to this definition, it is liberty.—In *ENGLAND formerly*, the law consigned to the flames all who denied certain established points of faith. Even *now*, it subjects to fines, imprisonment and banishment all teachers of religion who have not subscribed the doctrinal articles of the church of England; and the good Archbishop, not thinking the law, in this case sufficiently rigorous, has proposed putting Protestant Dissenters under the same restraints with the Papists. (a) And should this be done,

(a) “ The laws against Papists have been extremely severe. New dangers may arise; and if at any time ANOTHER DENOMINATION of men should be equally dangerous to our civil interests, it would be justifiable to lay them under similar restraints.” Page 57.—In another part of this sermon the great men in opposition (some of the first in the kingdom in respect of rank, ability, and virtue) are described as a body of men void of principle, who, without regarding the relation in which they stand to the community, have entered into a league for advancing their private interest, and “ who are held together by the same bond that keeps together the lowest and wickedest combinations.”—Was there ever such a censure delivered from a pulpit? What wonder

done, if done by *law*, it will be the establishment of *liberty*.

The truth is, that a government by law is or is not liberty, just as the laws are just or unjust; and as the body of the people do or do not participate in the power of making them. The learned Prelate ~~seems~~ to have thought otherwise, and therefore has given a definition of liberty, which might as well have been given of slavery.

At the conclusion of his sermon, the Archbishop adds words which he calls comfortable,  
addressed

is it that the Dissenters should come in for a share in his Grace's abuse?—Their political principles, he says, are growing dangerous.—On what does he ground this insinuation? He is mistaken if he imagines that they are all such delinquents as the author of the following tracts, or that they think universally as he does of the war with America. On this subject they are, like other bodies of men in the kingdom, of different opinions.—But I will tell him in what they agree.—They agree in detesting the doctrines of passive obedience and non-resistance. They are all WHIGS, enemies to arbitrary power, and firmly attached to those principles of civil and religious liberty which produced the GLORIOUS REVOLUTION and the HANOVERIAN SUCCESSION.—Such principles are the nation's best defence; and Protestant Dissenters have hitherto reckoned it their glory to be distinguished by zeal for them, and an adherence to them. ONCE these principles were *approved* by men in  
No good can be expected, if they are now reckoned

addressed to those who had been *patient in tribulation*,<sup>(a)</sup> and intimating that they might *rejoice in hope*, “a ray of brightness then appearing after a prospect which had been long dark.” And in an account which follows the sermon, from one of the missionaries in the province of New-York, it is said, that “the rebellion would undoubtedly be crushed, and that THEN will be the time for taking steps for the increase of the church in America, by granting it an episcopate.” In conformity to the sentiments of

(a) That is, the missionaries of the society in America.—  
The charter of the society declares the end of its incorporation to be “propagating the gospel in foreign parts, and making provision for the worship of God in those plantations which wanted the administration of God’s word and sacraments, and were abandoned to atheism and infidelity.” The chief business, on the contrary, of the society has been to provide for the support of *episcopalianism* in the northern colonies, and particularly NEW-ENGLAND, where the sacraments are more regularly administered, and the people less abandoned to infidelity, than perhaps in any country under heaven. The missionaries employed and paid by the society for this purpose, have generally been clergymen of the highest principles in church and state. America, having been for some time very hostile to men of such principles, most of them have been obliged to take refuge in this country; and here they have, I am afraid, been too successful in propagating ~~their own~~ resentments, in misleading our rulers, and widening the breach which has produced the present war.

this



this missionary, the Archbishop also expresses his hope, that the opportunity which such an event will give, for establishing episcopacy among the colonists, will not be lost; and advises, that measures should be thought of for that purpose, and for thereby rescuing the church from the persecution it has long suffered in *America*.

This is a subject so important, and it has been so much misrepresented, that I cannot help going out of my way to give a brief account of it.

It does not appear that the lay members themselves of the church in *America* have ever wished for Bishops. On the contrary, the assembly of *Virginia* (the first episcopal colony) some years ago returned thanks to two clergymen in that colony, who had protested against a resolution of the other clergy to petition for Bishops. The church *here* cannot have a right to *impose* Bishops on the church in another country; and, therefore, while churchmen in *America* are averse to Bishops, it must be persecution to send Bishops among them. The *Presbyterians*, and other religious sects there, are willing, from a sense of the reasonableness or toleration, to admit Bishops whenever the body of episcopalian laity shall desire them, provided security is given that they shall be officers merely spiritual, possessed of no other powers than those which are necessary to the full exercise of that mode

mode of religious worship. It is not Bishops, as *spiritual* officers, they have opposed; but Bishops on a state-establishment; Bishops with *civil* powers; Bishops at the head of ecclesiastical courts, maintained by taxing other sects, and possessed of a PRE-EMINENCE which would be incompatible with the equality which has long subsisted among all religious sects in *America*. In this last respect, the colonies have hitherto enjoyed a happiness which is unparalleled, but which the introduction of such Bishops, as would be sent from hence would destroy. In *Pensilvania* (one of the happiest countries under heaven before we carried into it desolation and carnage) all sects of christians have been always perfectly on a level, the legislature taking no part with any one sect against others, but protecting all equally as far as they are peaceable. The state of the colonies north of *Pensilvania* is much the same; and, in the province of *Massachusetts-Bay* in particular, civil authority interposes no farther in religion than by imposing a tax for supporting public worship, leaving to all the power of applying the tax to the support of that mode of public worship which they like best. This tax the episcopalians were, at one time, obliged to pay in common with others; but so far did the province carry its indulgence to them, that an act was passed on purpose to excuse them.

them.—With this let the state of Protestant Dissenters in this country be compared. Not only are they obliged to pay tithes for the support of the established church, but their worship is not even tolerated, unless their minister will subscribe the articles of the church. In consequence of having long scrupled this subscription, they have lost all legal right to protection, and are exposed to the cruellest penalties. Uneasy in such a situation, they not long ago applied twice to parliament for the repeal of the penal laws against them. Bills for that purpose were brought into the *House of Commons*, and passed that House. But, in the *House of Lords*, they were rejected in consequence of the opposition of the Bishops.—There are few I reverence so much as some on the sacred bench; but such conduct (and may I not add the alacrity with which most of them support the present measures?) must leave an indelible stain upon them, and will probably exclude them for ever from *America*.

On this occasion, I cannot help thinking with concern of the learned Prelate's feelings. After a prospect long dark, he had discovered a ray of brightness shewing him *America* reduced, and the church triumphant: But lately, that ray of brightness has vanished, and defeat has taken place of victory and conquest.—And what do we now see?—What a different prospect, mortifying  
to

to the learned Prelate, presents itself?—A great people likely to be formed, in spite of all our efforts, into free communities, under governments which have (a) no religious tests and establishments!—A new æra in future annals, and a new

(a) I am sorry to mention one exception to the fact here intimated. The new constitution for *Pennsylvania* (in other respects wise and liberal) is dishonoured by a religious test. It requires an acknowledgment of the divine inspiration of the Old and New Testament, as a condition of being admitted to a seat in the House of Representatives; directing however, at the same time, that no other religious test shall for ever hereafter be required of any civil officer.—This has been, probably, an accommodation to the prejudices of some of the narrower sects in the province, to which the more liberal part have for the present thought fit to yield; and, therefore, it may be expected that it will not be of long continuance.

Religious tests and subscriptions in general, and all establishments of particular systems of faith, with civil emoluments annexed, do inconceivable mischief, 'by turning religion into a trade, by engendering strife and persecution, by forming hypocrites, by obstructing the progress of truth, and fettering and perverting the human mind; nor will the world ever grow much wiser, or better, or happier, till, by the abolition of them, truth can gain fair play, and reason free scope for exertion. The Archbishop, page 11, speaks of christianity as "insufficient to rely on its own energies; and "of the assistances which it is the business of civil authority "to provide for gospel truths."—A worse slander was never thrown on gospel truths. Christianity disdains such assistances as the corrupted governments of this world are capable of giving it. Politicians and statesmen know little of it. Their *enmity* has sometimes done it good; but their *friendship*, by supporting corruptions carrying its name, has been almost fatal to it.

opening in human affairs beginning, among the descendants of *Englishmen*, in a new world;—A rising empire, extended over an immense continent, without BISHOPS,—without NOBLES,—and without KINGS.

*O the depth of the riches of the wisdom of God!  
How unsearchable are his judgments!*

But to proceed to another subject

In the second of the following tracts, page 48. I have observed, that in former times it was the custom of parliament to pass bills for appointing commissioners to take, state, and examine the public accounts. I have lately had it in my power to inform myself more particularly on this subject; and I shall here beg leave to give a brief recital of some of the principal facts relating to it.

The first bill for the purpose I have mentioned was passed in the times of the commonwealth, and in the year 1653. It was called an “act for accounts, and for clearing of public debts, and discovering frauds and concealments.” Seven commissioners were named in it, and the necessary powers given them. In 1667, another ~~was~~ was passed for the same purpose; after which I find no account of any such till the beginning of the reign of King William.

William. At this time complaints of mismanagement and embezzlements in the disposition of public money were become so prevalent, that the *House of Commons* thought it necessary to enter to measures for effectually preventing them, by obliging all revenue officers to make up their accounts, and bringing defaulters to justice.

With these views, six of the acts I have mentioned were passed between the years 1690 and 1701. Another was passed in the first of *Queen Anne*; and three more in her four last years. In *King William's* reign they were always passed by the *House of Commons* without a division. In *Queen Anne's* reign, not one passed without a division. In 1717, a motion for such an act was *rejected* without a division; and since 1717, only one motion (a) has been made for such a bill; and it was rejected by a majority of 136 to 66.

The preamble to these acts declares the reason of them to be, that “the kingdom may be satisfied and truly informed, whether all the monies granted by parliament have been faithfully issued and applied to the end for which they had been given; and that all loyal subjects may be thereby encouraged more chearfully to bear the burthens laid upon them.” The number of commissioners named in them was generally nine or seven, all members of the *House*

(a) In 1742, after the resignation of Sir Robert Walpole.

*of Commons.* It was particularly ordered, that they should take an account of all the revenues brought into the receipt of the Exchequer, and all arrears thereof; of all monies in the hands of the receivers general of the land-tax, customs, and excise; of all the public stores, provisions, &c. as well for land as sea service; of all ships of war, and the sums of money provided or paid for the use of the forces by sea and land; and the number of them respectively; and of any bribes, or corruptions in any persons concerned in the receiving or disposing of the national treasure. And, for these purposes, they were impowered to call before them, and to examine upon oath the officers of the exchequer, the secretary at war, paymaster of the forces, commissioners of the navy and ordnance, and all persons whatever employed as commissioners, or otherwise, in or about the *Treasury*.

The reports, which the commissioners thus appointed delivered from time to time to parliament, contain accounts of a waste of public money, arising from the rapacity of contractors, and many scandalous abuses and frauds in every part of the public service, which must shock every person not grown callous to all the feelings of honesty and honour. In consequence of these reports, the *House of Commons* addressed the throne, and remonstrated; several great men

were

were accused, and brought to shame; some were dismissed from their places, and ordered to be prosecuted; some expelled, and some committed to the Tower. Thus did our representatives, in those times discharge their duty as guardians of the public property; and it is, in my opinion; only by such means that they are capable of doing this properly and effectually. It must, however, be acknowledged, that these commissions of enquiry did not produce all the good effects which might have been expected from them. The influence of the crown, and the interest in parliament of many great men entrusted with the disposition of public money, rendered the proper execution of them extremely difficult. This led some even of the *Tories*, at the time of the great change of ministry in 1710, to propose, that the receiving and issuing of the public money should be taken from the crown; and, in defence of this proposal, it was urged, that the issuing of public money, being in some of the most despotic countries left in the hands of the people, it was by no means a necessary part of the royal prerogative. This would indeed have provided a complete remedy; and it might have perpetuated the constitution. But, even in these times, it was a reformation too great and too impracticable to engage much attention.

Ever



Ever since those times the public accounts have been growing more complicated ; and the temptations to profusion and embezzlement have been increasing with increasing luxury and dissipation. How astonishing then is it that every idea of such *commissions* should be now lost ; and that, at a time when the nation is labouring under expences almost too heavy to be borne, the passing of accounts by the *House of Commons* is become little more than a matter of form ; our representatives scarcely thinking it worth their while to attend ~~of~~ such occasions, and MILLIONS of the public treasure being sometimes given away, in a few hours, just as proposed by the *Treasury*, without debate or enquiry.

I must not forget to mention particularly on this subject, that the commissioners named in the acts I have described, were always declared incapable of holding any place or office of profit under the crown ; and directed to take an account “ of all “ pensions, salaries, and sums of money paid “ or payable to members of parliament out of “ the revenue or otherwise.”——Not long before this time, the *House of Commons* would not suffer, even the *Attorney-general* (a) to sit and vote in the

(a) Sir FRANCIS BACON was the *second* ATTORNEY-GENERAL who sat in the *House of Commons* ; but, to prevent ~~it~~ being drawn into a precedent, the House would not admit him, till they had made an order, that no Attorney-

the house, because he was the king's servant; and in 1678, a member, as Mr. *Trenchard* says, was committed to the Tower, for only saying in the house that the king might keep guards for his defence, if he could pay them.—Such *once* was the House of Commons—So jealous of the power of the crown, and so chaste.—Since the reign of Queen *Ann* and the passing of the *Septennial Act*, a great change has taken place. (a)

### A change

General should, for the future be allowed to sit and vote in that House.—In conformity to this order, whenever afterwards a member was appointed Attorney-General, his place was vacated, and a new writ issued. This continued to be the practice till the year 1670, when Sir HENEAGE FINCH (afterwards EARL OF NOTTINGHAM) being appointed Attorney-General, he was allowed by connivance to preserve his seat, which connivance has been continued ever since.—I give these facts not from any enquiry or knowledge of my own, but from the authority of a friend, who is perhaps better informed than any person in the kingdom on every subject of this kind.

(a) The following facts will shew, in some degree, how this change has been brought about.—For ten years ending Aug. 1, 1717 (a period comprehending in it a general war abroad; and the demise of the crown, the establishment of a new family, and an open rebellion at home) the money expended in secret services amounted only to 279,444 l.—For TEN YEARS ending Feb. 11, 1742, it amounted to no less a sum than 1,384,600; of which 507,771 was paid to printers of News-papers and writers for government; and a greater sum expended, in the last *six weeks* of these ten years, than had been spent in *three years* before Aug. 1710.—See the

A change which is little less than the total ruin of the constitution, and which may end in a tyranny the most oppressive and insupportable. It is, therefore, the greatest evil, which could have happened to us ; and the men, by whose abominable

the Report of the COMMITTEE appointed March 23, 1744, to enquire into the conduct of ROBERT EARL OF OXFORD, printed in the Journals of the House of Commons, vol. 24, p. 295, 296, 300.—One passage, in this report, contains remarks, so much to my present purpose and so important, that I cannot help copying it.——“ There are no laws particularly  
 “ adapted to the case of a minister who clandestinely employs the money of the public, and the whole power and  
 “ profitable employments that attend the collecting and disposing of it, *against* the people : And, by this profusion  
 “ and criminal distribution of offices, in some measure justifies the expence that particular persons are obliged to be  
 “ at, by making it necessary to the preservation of all that  
 “ is valuable to a free nation. For in that case, the contest  
 “ is plain and visible. It is, whether the Commons shall  
 “ retain the *third* state in their own hands ; while this  
 “ whole dispute is carried on at the expence of the people,  
 “ and, on the side of the minister, out of the money granted  
 “ to support and secure the constitutional independence of  
 “ the three branches of the legislature.—This method of  
 “ corruption is as sure, and, therefore, as criminal a way of  
 “ subverting the constitution as by an armed force. It is a  
 “ crime, productive of a total destruction of the very being  
 “ of this government ; and is so *high* and *unnatural*, that nothing but the powers of parliament can reach it ; and, as  
 “ it never can meet with parliamentary animadversion but  
 “ it is unsuccessful, it must seek for its security in the  
 “ extent

able policy it has been accomplished, ought to be followed with the everlasting execrations of every friend to public virtue and liberty.

I now withdraw to the situation of an anxious spectator of public events; but before I do this, I must leave with the public, at this threatening period, the following sentiments.

Not long ago, the colonies might have been kept, without bloodshed or trouble, by repealing the *acts* which have made us the aggressors in the present war; but *now* it would be great folly to expect this.—At the same time I think it certain, that they may be rendered more useful to us by a pacification on liberal terms, which shall bind them to us as FRIENDS, than by any victories or slaughters (were they possible) which can force them to submit to us as SUBJECTS.—I think it also certain, that should the offer of such terms be delayed till they have formed an alliance with *France*, this country is *UNDONE*.—Such an alliance, we may hope, is not yet settled.—Our rulers, therefore, may *possibly*

“ extent and efficacy of the mischief it produces.” P. 395.  
The obstructions which this committee met with in their enquiry proved, that the crime they here describe in such emphatical language; had *even then* obtained that very security, in the extent of the mischief it produced, which they observe it was under a necessity of seek-

have still a moment for paſſing and retreat-  
 ing, and every dictate of prudence and feel-  
 ing, of humanity requires them to be ſpeedy and  
 earneſt in improving it.—But what am I ſaying?  
 I know this muſt not be expected. Too full of  
 ideas of our own dignity; too proud to retract;  
 and too tenacious of dominion, we ſeem deter-  
 mined to perſiſt: And the conſequence muſt be,  
 that the colonies will become the allies of *France*;  
 that a general war will be kindled; and, perhaps,  
 this once happy country be made, in righteous  
 judgment, the ſeat of that deſolation and miſery  
 which it has produced in other countries.

January 19, 1776.

ACCOUNT.

## ACCOUNT of the CUSTOMS for the LAST SIX YEARS.

IN the following tracts I have reckoned, among the destructive consequences of the war with *America*, the loss of a considerable part of our trade. In consequence of several accidental causes, particularly the demand created by the war, this effect has not yet been so much felt as was generally expected. The truth, however, is, that the war has operated in this way to a degree that is remarkable and alarming, as will appear from the following account of the CUSTOMS for the last six years.

	Gross Receipt.	Debitures.	Net Receipt.	Payments into the Exchequer.
1772—	5.134,503	2.214,508	2.441,038	2.525,515
1773—	5.159,800	2.463,767	2.221,460	2.431,071
1774—	5.068,000	2.132,600	2.455,500	2.547,717
1775—	5.146,900	1.904,900	2.709,340	2.476,302
1776—	3.726,970	1.544,300	1.633,389	2.460,492

It should be observed, that though, in 1776, there had been no importation of *tabacco*, yet the duties on *tabacco* brought into the *Exchequer* as much as ever, these duties having been paid for old stock taken out of the warehouses for *home consumption*, instead of *exportation*. This is one of the causes which contributed to keep up the payments into the *Exchequer* in 1776, notwithstanding a sudden fall of near a MILLION AND A HALF in the gross receipt; and above a MILLION in the net produce.——In the last year, or 1777, the payments into the *Exchequer*, for the three quarters ended at *Michaelmas* last, had sunk near a quarter of a million. But what may be of more importance is,

the debentures (or duties returned at exportation) which had fallen in 1775 and 1776 above a *fourth*, continued to fall in 1777; and, in the port of LONDON (where commonly about three-fourths of the customs are paid) they did not amount last year to *half* the usual sum.

I have examined the customs from the Revolution to the present time; but I cannot find that any thing like such a fall in them has ever happened before. A dismal prelude, probably, to greater falls.

## ADVERTISEMENT.

THE present state of the public funds makes it necessary for me to acquaint the reader, that when the *Supplement* to the following Tracts was written, the 3 *per cent.* annuities were at the price which the calculations in it suppose, or nearly at 78. They have since fallen to 72, and once even below 69, which is a lower price than they were ever at during the whole last war, except just at the pinch of the loan of twelve millions in 1762.—The difference of price also between them and the new 4 *per cent.* is fallen, (for no reason that I can discover) from 14 to about 10½.—I find, likewise, that in consequence of a distressing scarcity of money, the subscribers to the last loan of *five millions* have not yet been able to complete their payments.—These facts afford a dark prospect; and make it doubtful whether, if things don't mend, it will be possible, by any schemes, to procure the money necessary to bear the expence of another campaign.—Should it happen, for these reasons, that what I have written on loans can be of no use; or, though capable of being of use, should it be neglected; I shall still reflect with satisfaction, that I have now given what I wished to offer on this subject with more correctness; and proved, beyond a doubt, that a great part of the National Debt is an *artificial* debt, for which no money has been received, and which might have been easily avoided.

---



---

# S U P P L E M E N T

T O

## SECTION III. PART II.

*Containing additional Observations on Schemes  
for raising Money by Public Loans:*

**I**T is impossible, that any attentive person can reflect without concern, on that monstrous accumulation of artificial debt for which no value has been received, which has been pointed out in different parts of the preceding Tract; and, particularly in the third Section of the second Part. This being a subject which, in the present state of our finances, is highly interesting; I have been induced to return to it in this place; and to offer some further observations and proposals which have occurred to me in re-considering it, and which I think necessary to explain and confirm those which have been already offered.

There are two methods in which money is capable of being borrowed for public services. The first is, by offering such *high* interest as may of itself be sufficient to induce lenders to advance the sums that are wanted: And the second is, by of-

O

fering



fering a *low* interest, with a *gratuity* or, *douceur* to produce the acceptance of it.—The last has been the method in which our government has most commonly borrowed money; and the gratuity offered has been either a right to a greater capital, than the sum advanced, or a *long* or *short* or *life* annuity, or the profits of a lottery, or some advantages of trade.—The first without doubt, is the most rational method of borrowing; and the latter is so *absurd* and *extravagant* as to be incapable of being adopted in the common transactions of life.—In order to give a just and full idea of this, I shall instance in the last loan; specifying the manner in which it *would* have been made if the usual method of borrowing had been followed, and comparing this with the manner in which it *was* made; and the manner in which, I think, it *might* have been made to the greatest advantage.

FIVE MILLIONS, it is well known, were borrowed last year; and, had the old plan of borrowing been adopted, this sum would have been borrowed by some such scheme as one of the *two* following.

First. Interest in the public funds being then near 4 *per cent. per ann.* an interest of only 3 *per cent.* would have been offered; or, in other words, for every 100l. in money, 100l. *stock* carrying 3 *per cent.* (worth then, 78l.) would have been given; but at the same time, as a *premium* or *compensation* for accepting such low interest, a life annuity, or  
a short

a short annuity would have been offered worth somewhat more than the difference between 100l. and 78l. or about 24l. The whole premium, therefore, in raising *five millions*, would have been equal in value to about 1,200,000l. and, supposing it to have been either a life-annuity, or a short annuity for 17 years of 2l. worth 12 years purchase, annexed to every 100l. stock, the whole annual charge incurred by the loan would have been 253,000l. for a term of years, and 150,000l. for ever till the capital is redeemed.

It is manifest that the capital including in it according to this account almost the whole *premium*, the public makes itself, by this mode of borrowing, a *debtor* for the very thing it gives; and, besides paying the annuity, obliges itself to advance at redemption the whole value of it.—It is proper to add, that this is done *unnecessarily*, because 1,200,000 might have been procured by selling the annuity, and the remaining 3,800,000l. necessary to make up five millions, might have been procured, as will be shewn presently, without any *doceur* by giving higher interest.

But there is another method of borrowing, which has been practised by government on former occasions, and which might have been adopted in the last loan.

For every 100l. advanced a new capital in the *per cent.* funds worth that sum would have been

sold, including a funded 10l. lottery ticket. This new capital would have been nearly 127l. three *per cent.* stock for every 100l. in money, or 6,343,954l. stock for FIVE MILLIONS in money; of which stock 5,718,954l. would have been sold, to encourage subscriptions, at 2 *per cent.* below the market price, that is, at 76l.  $\frac{1}{2}$ ; and the remaining stock, having a lottery annexed, would have been sold at *par*. A fictitious or artificial capital, therefore, would have been created, or a debt incurred more than the value received, of 1,343,954l. besides relinquishing about 150,000l. which might have been obtained by the profits of the lottery.

I have been seldom more surprized than at the preference of this scheme, which, at the time of settling the last loan, was expressed by some very respectable members of the House of Commons; nor can this preference be easily accounted for on any other supposition than that they consider the public debts as incumbrances, never to be removed, and, therefore, think it of no consequence with what difficulties the redemption of them is loaded by an increase of capitals bearing low interest. It must be acknowledged indeed that this method of borrowing would have been attended with a small present advantage; for the interest of 6,343,954l. at 3 *per cent.* is 190,318l. and this, together with the interest of 150,000l.

or 6000*l.* *per ann.* lost by giving up the profits of a lottery, would have been the whole present annual charge it would have brought on the public. But if this be a sufficient reason for preferring such a scheme, it would perhaps be best to create capitals bearing 2 *per cent.* or even 1 *per cent.* interest; for probably such capitals would bear a better price, in proportion to the rates of interest, than any 3 *per cent.* capitals, and consequently, a greater present saving might be made by selling them. No other objection can be made to this than that by lowering interest, and laying the public under an obligation to return *double* or *triple* every sum it receives; the redemption of the public debts might be rendered so expensive and difficult as to be entirely impracticable. But this would be of no consequence if indeed their redemption is already become impracticable; and if, therefore, every new charge they bring on the public is to be considered as laid on for eternity.

With these schemes, let us now compare the scheme actually adopted for the last loan.

Instead of a 3 *per cent.* capital, a new capital bearing 4 *per cent.* interest, irredeemable for ten years, was offered at 95*l.* for every 100*l.* stock, with two *douzeurs* to raise the value of the stock above 100*l.* in money; namely, a short annuity

of a HALF *per cent.* for ten years, (reckoned worth 4l. 2s.) and the profit (reckoned at 3l.) of one ticket in a money lottery consisting of 50,000 tickets.

The chief difference between this scheme and the first I have described is, that the new stock created is a FOUR *per cent.* instead of a THREE *per cent.* stock. But this is a difference of particular importance, and brings it near to such plans of borrowing as appear to me the best.—In the *first* scheme, the artificial capital is 1,200,000l. In the *second*, 1,343,954l. In this *third* scheme it is only 250,000l. This scheme, therefore, has evidently great merit; and perhaps, in the present state of the public debts, it does not admit of any great improvement. There is, however, an easy alteration which, I think, would have been an improvement, and which I shall take the liberty to mention.

According to a preceding observation, the two *douceurs* being included in the capital, are granted, and must be paid twice over. This is so absurd and extravagant that it ought to be avoided as far as possible; and it might have been avoided, in a great measure, by offering for every 100l. advanced 95l. stock, carrying 4 and a quarter interest irredeemable for ten years, with the same  
short

short annuity, and a lottery ticket annexed. (a) In this case, the new capital would have been 4,750,000*l.* carrying (at  $4\frac{1}{4}$  *per cent.*) 201,875*l.* *per ann.* interest. There would, therefore, have been a saving of 250,000*l.* in the capital; and the annual charge would have been nearly the same.

It must be observed that this scheme supposes that a stock bearing  $4\frac{1}{4}$  *per cent.* interest would have been valued nearly at *par*; and, according to the principles on which the scheme was calculated, it could not have been valued at much less; or, supposing it valued at 1 or 2 *per cent.* less, the difference might have been made up by only adding two or three years to the duration of the short annuity and the term of irredeemableness.—I had a stock been offered bearing  $4\frac{1}{2}$  *per cent.* interest irredeemable for ten years, one half at least of the short annuity might have been saved. The annual charge for ten years would have been somewhat less; (b) and the excess afterwards would have been

(a) Or, for every 105*l.* contributed, 100*l.* stock irredeemable for 10 years might have been given, carrying  $4\frac{1}{4}$  *per cent.* interest, with the same short annuity and a lottery ticket annexed; and then the new capital would have been 4,762,000*l.* carrying (at  $4\frac{1}{4}$  *per cent.*) 202,385*l.* *per ann.* interest. The amount of the short annuity would have been 23,810*l.* and the number of lottery tickets 47,620.

(b) 211,375*l.* the interest at  $4\frac{1}{4}$  of 4,750,000*l.* and 12,500*l.* a short annuity of a QUARTER *per cent.* annexed to every 100*l.*

been much more than compensated by the advantages at redemption attending a higher interest and a smaller capital.

But, perhaps, such a scheme as the following would have been preferable to any of those now proposed.

For every 100*l.* in money 75*l.* stock irredeemable for 10 years and carrying  $4\frac{1}{4}$  *per cent.* interest, might have been offered, together with an annuity for 27 years of  $1\frac{1}{2}$  *per cent.* (valued cheap at 16 years purchase, or 24*l.*) and the advantage of a lottery ticket. This scheme would have been as likely to be attended with a profit as that which was adopted. The new capital would have been only 3,750,000*l.* bearing 159,375*l.* interest. The short annuity would have been 75,000*l.* and the whole annual charge (supposing no redemptions of the capital to take place after ten years) 234,375*l.* for 27 years, and afterwards 159,375*l.* It appears, therefore, that 1,250,000*l.* or a quarter of the capital that was actually created, would have been saved; and also a *rept* charge on the public after 27 years of 40,750*l.* *per ann.* for ever.—The additional expence to balance these advantages would have been 9,650*l.* *per ann.* for ten years, and 34,375*l.* *per ann.* for 17 years. In other contributed, make 23,875*l.* This last sum, therefore, would have been the annual charge for 10 years; and the first sum the annual charge after ten years till redemption.

words;

words; the public would have absolutely secured the redemption of, a *quarter* of the loan, (or of 1,250,000*l.*) besides an easier redemption of the remainder, at the expence of 680,875*l.* in the whole, (a) to be paid annually in small sums during the course of 27 years.

All that has been now said has gone on the supposition that, agreeably to the calculations on which the last loan was formed, 100*l.* stock irredeemable for ten years and bearing 4 *per cent.* interest, would sell at 17*l.* more than 100*l.* stock bearing 3 *per cent.* interest; (or at 95*l.* when the latter stock is at 78*l.*) and also, that a short annuity for ten years would sell at 8  $\frac{1}{2}$  years purchase.—But events have shewn that these valuations were too high. The new subscription (including 100*l.* four *per cent.* stock, a half *per cent.* short annuity, and the profit of a lottery ticket) should have sold, according to these valuations, at about 102  $\frac{1}{2}$ . But it never bore so high a price; and in a little time it fell to *par*, and at last to 3 *per cent.* discount.—Various reasons have been assigned for this; but the true reasons were the following.

First. A general fall of near 2 *per cent.* which took place in the stocks soon after the loan was settled.

(a) Ten payments of 9,650*l.* and seventeen payments of 34,375*l.* make 680,875*l.*

Secondly,



Secondly. A lower valuation of the new 4 *per cent.* stock and the short annuity which took place in the *ALLEY*.—This was the principal reason ; and it will be proper particularly to explain it. In doing this, it will be necessary to look back a little to the history of the public funds.

In 1717 the public debts were reduced from an interest of 6 *per cent.* to 5 *per cent.* and in 1727, from 5 *per cent.* to 4 *per cent.* In 1737 a bill was brought into the HOUSE OF COMMONS by Sir John Barnard, for a farther reduction from 4 to 3 *per cent.* At this time the 3 *per cents.* were above *par* ; and even, during the three first years of the war which began in 1740, they continued so high that government was able to raise the necessary supplies by borrowing at 3 *per cent.*—In such circumstances, it was impossible the public creditors should avoid expecting a *third* reduction ; and this expectation would necessarily sink the value of the FOUR PER CENTS. by leading the public to consider them as no more than a THREE *per cent.* stock having a short annuity of ONE *per cent.* annexed. Accordingly ; before the war the difference of price between the THREE and the FOUR *per cent.* stocks was about 10 or 11 *per cent.* After the commencement of the war, a reduction becoming more doubtful and more distant, this difference became greater, and generally kept between

tween 14 and 17 *per cent.* At the approach of the PEACE in 1748, it sunk to 11 *per cent.* and soon after the PEACE, the 3 *per cents.* having risen considerably above *par*; (a) and an universal expectation of a speedy reduction taking place, it sunk to 6 *per cent.* — It is evident, therefore, that the price of the FOUR *per cents.* has been governed by the expectation of their reduction, (b) and that, had there been no such expectation, their price, compared with the 3 *per cents.* would have been much higher. It will appear presently to be most probable, that had it not been for this expectation, the prices of these stocks would not have differed much from the proportion of the rates of interest. In taking this account, I have only compared the THREE *per cents.* with the SOUTH-SEA FOUR *per*

(a) It may be worth observing, that during this whole war they never fell below 82, except for a few months during the rebellion in 1745; that after the PEACE in 1748 they rose to 105, and in the succeeding war never fell so low as they are now, except in the two last years; that after the PEACE in 1763 it was expected they would again rise above *par*; but that, instead of this, they have in general during the whole peace kept 12 or 13 *per cent.* below *par*, and 15 or 16 *per cent.* below the price they bore before the two last wars. — One of the reasons of the great alteration which has taken place since the last war is, I think, pointed out in the 3d Section of the 3d Part of this Tract.

(b) Since the reduction in 1749 there has been no FOUR *per cent.* capital created except that of the last year.

*cent.*

*cent.* capitals before their reduction in 1749, at which time they amounted to above £7 millions, and were (as the consolidated three *per cent.* annuities are now) the grand staple stock of the kingdom. In 1746 and 1747, two new FOUR *per cent.* capitals were created redeemable at any time, and transferrable at the BANK. The price of these new capitals kept for some time after their creation, considerably below the price of the old SOUTH-SEA four *per cents.* the reasons of which were, I suppose, the general reasons which make new funds bear a lower price than old ones; and, particularly, their having less traffic in them, and being small and detached parcels likely to be first selected for the operations of finance.

Were the cause now assigned, or the expectation of a reduction of interest, the only cause that governed the comparative prices of 3 *per cent.* and 4 *per cent.* capitals, the excess of one above the other would never be more than the supposed value of a short annuity of 1*l.* till reduction. — But there is another cause which may operate in this instance, and which ought not to be overlooked; I mean, the expectation of a greater payment at redemption. The effect of the former is to diminish, and of the latter to increase the value of FOUR *per cent.* capitals. — In order to understand this it must be remembered, that when the 3 *per cents.* are at any considerable

considerable discount, it becomes practicable to redeem them under *par*, while debts bearing 4 *per cent.* interest must be redeemed at *par*. This will make a difference in favour of the latter, which will be greater or less in proportion to the greater or less discount at which the *three per cents.* are sold, the greater or less quantity of stock bearing 4 *per cent.* interest, and the greater or less probability that the whole or a considerable part of it will be soon redeemed (a)——Let us suppose, for instance, that all the public debts bearing 4 *per cent.*

(a) What is here said has been verified, in the particular instance of a *million and a half*, borrowed in 1756, which was to carry 3½ *per cent.* interest till 1771, and then to become redeemable.——During the last war, and for about three years after the commencement of peace, there was a general expectation that the *THREE per cent.* would rise above *par* as they had done in the former peace; and while this expectation continued, this stock was reckoned no better than a *THREE per cent.* stock with a short annuity of a *half per cent.* annexed; and for this reason it bore, during that period, a lower price than another stock of 4 millions and a half which was to bear the same interest till 1782, and then to become redeemable, and to sink to an interest of 3 *per cent.*——In the latter end of 1767 and beginning of 1768 the price of the former stock rose above that of the latter, and continued not far from *par* from that time to the time of its redemption in 1771. The reason must have been, that being a small stock bearing a higher interest than the other stocks, it was expected, that it would be paid off at *par*, and therefore with a considerable profit, as soon as it became redeemable; which accordingly happened. See Postscript, page 177.

interest

interest, consist of a single capital of FIVE MILLIONS redeemable at any time; and that all the rest of the public debts are THREE *per cent.* capitals sold at a discount of 12 *per cent.* or at 88l. for every 100l. stock. In these circumstances, there would be a certainty that the small stock bearing 4 *per cent.* interest would be selected for redemption as soon as possible; and, as a stock carrying such high interest could not be expected, when the 3 *per cents.* are at 88, to be redeemed under *par*, its real value would on this account exceed that of the THREE *per cents.* more or less in proportion as its redemption was more or less distant. And its whole excess of value in these circumstances is to be computed in the following manner.—It would consist of a 3 *per cent.* capital, for every 100l. of which 100l. in money is to be received; and of an additional annuity of 1 *per cent.* till redemption. Its excess of value, therefore, if the whole capital was to be redeemed immediately, would be the same with the discount of the 3 *per cents.* or 12 *per cent.* If the capital was not to be redeemed till the end of 7 years, its excess of value would consist of 12 *per cent.* payable seven years hence, and the present worth of an annuity of 1 *per cent.* for the intermediate term of seven years. 12l. payable at the end of 7 years is worth in present money (allowing compound interest at 4 *per cent.*) 9l. 2s. 6d. An annuity of 1l. for seven years is worth

worth

worth (reckoning the same interest) 6l. The whole excess of value, therefore, will be 15l. 2s. 6d. for every 100l. stock. If the redemption of the capital is to be delayed 15 years, the excess of value computed in the same manner will be 17l. 15s. 6d. —if 20 years, 19l. 1s.—if 30 years, 21l.

If the 3 *per cents.* had been supposed at a greater discount, it is evident that these several values would have been likewise greater; and had the quantity of 4 *per cent.* stock been supposed *double* or *triple*, the effect would have been the same with a delay of redemption; and had it been supposed thirty or forty millions; the effect (in consequence of our slow progress in redeeming our debts) would not have fallen very short of an eternal delay of redemption.

Before 1749, the amount of the public debts carrying 4 *per cent.* interest was near 8 millions. The expectation, therefore, of the advantage now explained could not *then* have any effect; and the only cause which could have influenced, in any considerable degree, the comparative prices of these stocks must have been the first I have assigned, or the expectation of their *reduction*, that is, in other words, the expectation of a *sudden redemption* of them, as soon as the 3 *per cents.* got above *par*, by borrowing money at that interest. Had not this been foreseen, or had there been an act of parliament rendering it impracticable,

ble, there is no reason to doubt but the price of the *four per cents.* compared with the *three per cents.* would have approached nearly to the proportion of the rates of interest, agreeably to what is said in page 191.

The state of the public funds has been much changed since the two last wars; but it is an alteration that has increased the comparative value of *4 per cent.* capitals.

I have already observed, that during the last war there was reason to expect, that, as soon as peace came, the *three per cents.* would rise above *par.* No one can now entertain any such expectation. On the contrary; it is most probable, that they will never again rise to that which has been their average price during the last peace from 1763 to 1775, and which, I think, may be stated at 87 or 88.—My reason for this assertion is,

First, that after the present war, should we be so happy as to escape the ruin with which it threatens us, our taxes and expences will be so much increased, and at the same time our resources so much diminished, as necessarily to leave the credit and value of our public securities lower than ever.

Secondly. Though our credit and resources should continue undiminished, yet the great addition which the present war will make to the public debts, is alone likely to sink their value; because

because every increase of a saleable commodity has always a tendency to lower its price.—It follows from hence, that the purchasers of *four per cent.* capitals have now a prospect of an advantage of 12 or 14 *per cent.* at redemption, which they could not have had before the last peace.

In connexion with this it must be considered, that it is now highly probable, that it will never be again practicable to reduce the interest of any *4 per cent.* capitals. In order to such a reduction, government must be able to offer to the proprietors of these capitals their *principal*, should they not chuse to take lower interest, and consequently to borrow at an interest of  $3\frac{1}{2}$  or  $3\frac{1}{4}$  *per cent.* But no sums will be lent on such lower interest, unless it can be depended upon that capitals bearing that interest, when brought to market, will bear a premium of 1 or 2 *per cent.*; and this, when the *three per cents.* are not higher than 87 or 88, would require the excess of value of such capitals to be estimated at 14 or 15 *per cent.* whereas it has been lately found, that even *four per cent.* capitals irredeemable for ten years, will not bear such an excess of value.—A reduction, therefore, of the interest of *four per cent.* capitals, or a redemption of them by borrowed money, cannot now be reckoned upon; and the only cause that can REASONABLY sink their value compared with the *THREE per cents.* below the ratio of the rates of interest, is



the probability of a redemption of them by the surplus of the national revenue. I need not say how little is to be expected from hence. Supposing, however, that much may be expected, I have shewn what effect it ought to have; and from the observations I have made, and particularly the computation in page 194, &c. it appears, I think, that the price of the capital of five millions four *per cent.* annuities lately created ought to have been near 18 *per cent.* more than the price of the *THREE per cents.* This appears to be true on the supposition that this capital will be redeemed in fifteen years; (that is, in five years after the expiration of the term for which it is made irredeemable) that the 3 *per cents.* will rise to as high a price as they bore during the last peace; and that purchasers are allowed to make four *per cent.* compound interest of their money.—Were we to suppose this capital discharged even in two years after it becomes redeemable, the value, made out in the same way, would be nearly 17l.

He who will consider all this, and also recollect the general price of the 4 *per cents.* before their reduction in 1749, (see page 190) must be convinced that the TREASURY, at the time the last loan was settled, had good reason for taking the price of the new *four per cent.* capitals 17 *per cent.* higher than the price of the three *per cents.*—It has, however, been found that this was too high a valuation. Instead of being sold at 17l. more for every

every 100*l.* stock than the 3 *per cents.* they have been sold at only 13*l.* or 14*l.* more; and this has been the chief reason of the discount to which the last subscription fell.—It is hard to say, by what principles the money'd men who traffic in the funds have governed themselves in this instance; but certain it is, that they have not been guided by any of the rules of just calculation: And the same must be said of the value at which they have reckoned the short annuity of a half *per cent.* for ten years annexed to the new 4 *per cents.* In forming the scheme for the last loan this annuity was, I have said, estimated at 8  $\frac{1}{8}$  years purchase, agreeably to its real value, supposing the payments yearly, the first payment to be made at the distance of a year, and money improved at 4 *per cent.* compound interest. But it has in general been sold at about 7  $\frac{1}{2}$  years purchase; which is *less* than its value, supposing money improved at 5  $\frac{1}{2}$  *per cent.* compound interest. (a)

(a) Nothing has been more undervalued in the ALLEY than *Annuities on lives.* They have been always granted, very unreasonably, without any limitation of age; and their value has been taken at no more than 12 or 13 years purchase, tho' really worth one with another 16 or 17 years purchase. This is a strong reason for preferring short annuities to them in all schemes for raising money. Short annuities for 21 years will be taken for as much as life-annuities; and yet experience has proved that in this time not a *quarter* of the life-annuities will drop; and the whole expence brought by them on the public will not be removed in less than 20 or 20 years. See Note 15, Page 134.

From this account it appears, that could the caprice of the public have been foreseen, the price of the new four *per cents.* should not have been reckoned at more than 91l.; (the 3 *per cents.* being at 78l.) and that, consequently, to make up a value which would have produced 102l. for every 100l. advanced, either the term of irredeemableness and of the short annuity should have been lengthened; or, supposing this term the same, the short annuity should have been more than doubled. An artificial capital, indeed, of near half a million would in this case have been created. But this disadvantage might have been avoided, without bringing any additional expence on the public, by such alterations as I have before proposed; and by increasing in the corrected schemes, page 186, &c. either the term of irredeemableness, or the short annuity, or the rate of interest, or all of them together.

The preceding account will, I fancy, help to shew what is practicable, *taking things as they are*, in borrowing money for public uses. It proves, that the nation loses greatly by the low price of all capitals bearing a higher interest than 3 *per cent.* and that could their value be raised, it would be greatly benefited.—For example. Could the new four *per cents.* have been taken at 99l. for every 100l. stock, instead of 95l. the whole expence

pence

pence of the short annuity in the scheme of the last loan, and of a *quarter per cent.* perpetual interest, in the corrected schemes, page 186, &c. might have been saved. But had the value of the 4 *per cents.* been raised in proportion to the rate of interest, or *nearly* in that proportion, a farther saving might have been made, in all the schemes, of the profits of the lottery, and, consequently, of 6000*l.* *per annum* in the annual charge.—My next enquiry, therefore, shall be, in what manner and by what regulations this may be done. I have written in the section on loans, on the supposition that such regulations are practicable; and I have proposed one of them; but I will here be more explicit.

It has been shewn, that before 1749 the cause which depressed the value of the 4 *per cents.* was the expectation of their being reduced; and that *now* this cause is the expectation of their being soon *redeemed*. Remove, therefore, these causes in any degree, and their value must rise in the same degree.—With respect to the first, it is in my opinion certain that it would be doing great service to the public to exclude it entirely. Our reductions of interest have proceeded from a policy too narrow; and the nation is likely to

P 3
suffer

suffer by them much more than it has gained. (a) The savings they produce, being expended on current services, tempt to extravagance; give a fallacious appearance of opulence; and, by making our debts 'sit' lighter, render us less anxious about redeeming them, and less apprehensive of danger from the increase of them. At the same time they render their redemption a work of more difficulty, and oblige government, when under a necessity of contracting new debts, either to give extravagant interest, or to offer extravagant premiums. That accumulation of artificial debts which I have pointed out has been owing principally to this cause; and had it not been, in particular, for the reduction in 1749, the public debts would now have been near 14 millions less; and a debt of above a hundred millions, instead of consisting of capitals bearing interest at 3 *per cent.* would have consisted of capitals bearing some of them 3½, some 4, and some 4½ and 5 *per cent.* interest, which (supposing them all at a medium to bear 4 *per cent.*) a million *per ann.* would have redeemed in six years less

(a) I would except here the first reduction in 1717. This was then necessary to gain a fund for sinking the public debts; and had the fund thus gained been applied, as the laws required, invariably to this purpose, and all farther reductions been avoided, we should now have been burthened with no debts.

time, and at twenty-one millions less expence.— In short; reducing of interest is one of those unhappy TEMPORARY EXPEDIENTS to which statesmen are apt to betake themselves; and by which *present* relief is gained at the expence of *future* safety, and distress postponed by rendering it in the end more unavoidable and dreadful.—There cannot, therefore, be any sufficient reason against making the interest of the new capitals which may be created by any future loans, IRREDUCIBLE. (a) Should this raise the price of capitals bearing high interest in proportion to the increase of interest, government would be enabled to borrow to equal advantage whatever interest it offered; the new loans would not bring any greater annual charge on the nation than would have been necessary had the same sums been obtained by selling 3 per cent. capitals; and, at the same time, all the immense expence of *douceurs* and *fictitious capitals* would be saved, and all the advantages in redeeming the public debts obtained, arising from smaller capitals bearing higher interest.

Such a regulation as that now proposed would be alone sufficient for these purposes, when the amount of the debts bearing high interest and declared irreducible, is considerable, as appears

(a) That is; never capable of being redeemed by substituting one debt for another; or of being saved from redemption by accepting lower interest.

from what is said in page 195. But when a debt happens to bear a higher interest than any other, and is at the same time small, the probability of a *quick redemption* will operate in the same manner on its price with the expectation of a *reduction*; and in this case, therefore, it will become necessary, in order to avoid the inconveniences I have described, to POSTPONE REDEMPTION; and one of the best methods of doing this will be, by ordering, that such a debt shall be redeemed *after* some other given part of the funded public debts.—So slow has been our progress in redeeming debts, that this (supposing the part to be first redeemed considerable) would be reckoned, in the present circumstances of the funds, the same with making the debt to be last redeemed, irredeemable for ever. And should such an apprehension prove right, the public would lose nothing, because the debt whose redemption was postponed, would bring no greater annual charge on the public, than if the same sum had been obtained by selling a capital bearing any lower interest. But should it prove false, or should our debts be ever put into a fixed course of redemption, the public would gain greatly by being able, after discharging one part of its debts, to discharge the remainder more expeditiously and easily.

I shall beg leave to illustrate what has been now said by having recourse again to the last loan of

**FIVE MILLIONS.**—During the last 60 years, or from the first establishment of the sinking fund, to the year 1777, no more than about **FIFTEEN MILLIONS** of the public funded debts, have been paid. An order, therefore, that the capital of five millions bearing ~~4~~ *per cent.* created by the last loan, should not be discharged unless a capital of twenty-five or thirty millions in the three *per cents.* shall have been *first* discharged, would have carried its redemption to so distant a period, as might probably have raised it to the same comparative value with any *3 per cent.* capitals.

Let it, however, be supposed to advance its price only to 102l. when the *3 per cents.* are at 78; that is, when the ratio of the rates of interest required the price to be at 104. In these circumstances, 4.850,000l. of the five millions would have been advanced for an equal capital carrying 194,000l. interest at *4 per cent.*; and the remaining 150,000l. would have been advanced for the lottery: And thus the whole expence of the short annuity, and 150,000l. capital, would have been saved.—And had the same sum been obtained by selling a *3 per cent.* capital, the amount of interest, though the least possible, would not have been much less; (a)

(a) Supposing the *3 per cents.* sold at  $76\frac{1}{2}$ , the capital necessary to produce 4.850,000l. in money would be 6.339,869l. the interest of which at *3 per cent.* is 190,195l.

but,



but, at redemption, there would have been a necessity of paying above a MILLION AND A QUARTER for which no value had been received. — When such advantages, uncompensated by any loss, can be obtained by so easy and simple a regulation as only changing the ORDER of paying the public debts, (a) what possible reason can there be against adopting it?

There is another method by which the value of any stocks bearing high interest might be raised, which would probably be no less effectual; I mean, by ordering that no part of such stocks shall be redeemed, without at the same time redeeming an *equal*, or any *larger* sum, in other capitals. This is the regulation proposed in the section on public loans, page 98; and it will not be amiss here to give an illustration of it, by supposing, that EIGHT MILLIONS will be wanted for the necessary supplies of this year; and that this sum will be procured by selling, as was done in the last loan, a capital equal to the sum advanced, bearing 4 *per cent.* interest. Were the

(a) When the amount of interest, payable for a sum obtained by selling a 4 *per cent.* capital, is the same with the amount of interest, payable for an equal sum obtained by selling a 3 *per cent.* capital, which is nearly the present case, postponing, in the manner I have proposed, the redemption of the former, becomes as indifferent as it would be to postpone in the same manner the redemption of any 3 *per cents.*

interest

interest in this case made irreducible, and the capital incapable of being redeemed without at the same time redeeming four times as much of the 3 *per cent.* or some other stocks, an increase of value would be communicated to it which would render all *Douceurs* unnecessary. For it would be a capital, the redemption of which could not be completed without discharging in all FORTY (a) MILLIONS of the public debts.——I cannot doubt but that, in these circumstances (supposing the price of the 3 *per cents.* to continue near 78) a 100 l. in money would be given for 100 l. in such a stock, and the whole extravagant expence of short annuities, lotteries, and artificial capitals would be saved.

(a) In this case only a FIFTH of the *surplus* to be at any time employed in redeeming debts could be applied to the redemption of this *particular* loan. The rest after nine years might be employed in redeeming the 4 *per cent.* stock created last year; or jointly with it, such parts of future loans bearing high interest, as, in borrowing on the same plan, might be left redeemable. And thus no obligation would arise from this mode of borrowing to prefer the redemption of 3 *per cents.* to the redemption of capitals bearing higher interest. In particular; had this been the plan of borrowing through the last war, all surplus monies might have been ever since employed intirely in paying off 4, 4½ and 5 *per cent.* capitals préferably to any others; and at the same time, no *douceurs* would have been granted in order to procure the loans, no artificial debt contracted, or extraordinary charge incurred.

In

In short. With the aid of such regulations as those now proposed, EIGHT MILLIONS might this year be borrowed (supposing the 3 *per cents.* not lower than 78 or 77) *probably* at an interest of 4 *per cent.*, but *certainly* at an interest an EIGHTH or a QUARTER higher, without offering any *premiums*. Whereas, if no such regulations are established, either an artificial debt of near (a) *two millions and a half* must be created; or 5 *per cent.* for 15 or 20 years certain, together with the profits of a lottery, must be given; and a new tax laid which will produce 400,000 l. *per ann.*

It may deserve to be added, that an unprosperous state of public affairs, and apprehensions of public danger, would have a tendency, by placing the redemption of our debts at a greater distance, to promote, rather than obstruct the success of schemes attended with such regulations.

There remains one proposal more on this subject which I wish may be attended to.

(a) Should this be disregarded, and a long annuity offered, as a *douceur*, of  $1\frac{1}{2}$  *per cent.* for 90 or 100 years, eight millions might perhaps be borrowed at an interest, including the long annuity, of  $4\frac{1}{2}$  *per cent.* even though the 3 *per cents.* should fall as low as 73.—And this, *probably*, would be the very scheme a minister would prefer, who, minding chiefly present ease, ot care how much he burdened the nation hereafter.

I have

I have observed, that our reductions of interest have been the effect of too narrow a policy. It seems to me, that one of the best measures that could now be adopted, would be to undo what we have done in this instance, by restoring the 3 *per cent.* capitals to a higher interest, and making this restoration, one of the means of raising the necessary supplies. That this is practicable, and that it would be advantageous, will appear from the following scheme, and observations.

For 20 l. in money, let 110 l. stock bearing 3½ *per cent.* interest, be offered, in exchange for every 100 l. of the 3 *per cent.* stocks; and let the new 3½ *per cent.* stock be capable of being redeemed at any time, but never under *par*, unless when the price of the 3 *per cents.* happens to be below 85 l.—By this scheme the public would procure 20 l. from the conversion of every 100 l. 3 *per cent.* stock into 110 l. stock carrying 3½ *per cent.*; or FIVE MILLIONS from the conversion of TWENTY-FIVE MILLIONS. The new *additional* capital would be only TWO MILLIONS AND A HALF, (or 10 *per cent.* of the old capital); and the *additional* interest would be 17 s. (that is, a half *per cent.* added to 7 s. the interest of 10 l. at 3½ *per cent.*) for every 20 l. advanced; or 4¼ *per cent.* for the whole loan.

That such a scheme would afford ample encouragement to subscriptions, supposing the 3 *per cents.*

*cents.* at or near 78, will appear from considering, that the interest offered is above a *quarter per cent.* more than could be made by purchasing any perpetual annuities, and at the same time, in consequence of forming a part of the interest of a *THREE AND A HALF per cent.* capital, is incapable of reduction, and therefore nearly on an equal footing with the interest of any 3 *per cent.* capital.—But to be a little more explicit.

The new capital of 1101. bearing  $3\frac{1}{2}$  *per cent.* interest would be better than the 1001. *THREE per cent.* capitals for which it would be substituted, in the following respects.—1<sup>st</sup>. It would carry 17*s.* *per ann.* more interest; and such an interest, when the price of an annuity of 3*l.* is 78*l.*, ought to be worth 22*l.* 2*s.* The additional interest, therefore, would be disposed of at 2*l.* 2*s.* for every sum of 22*l.* 2*s.* (or at  $9\frac{1}{2}$  *per cent.*) less than its true value, compared with the price of the 3 *per cent.* annuities.

Secondly. The 3 *per cents.* when *peace* comes, will probably be capable of being redeemed at 88*l.* (a) But this stock, in the same circumstances, must be redeemed at *par.* It will, therefore, produce 12*l.* more in every 100*l.* at redemption. Add the 10*l.* additional stock; and the whole additional sum to be received at redemption

(a) In 1774, a million of the 3 *per cents.* was redeemed at this price; and in 1772, a million and a half at 90.

will

will be 22 l. — There will, therefore, be a profit at redemption of 10 l. *per cent.* of the money advanced; and this profit deserves the more notice, because the stock to which it is annexed, being redeemable at any time, and bearing a higher interest than the 3 *per cents.* will be selected for redemption before them; and therefore its price will be so much the more likely always to keep near *par*. — Setting aside, however, this advantage, and supposing only the 20 l. advanced likely to be received at redemption, it may be found by calculating in the manner explained in p. 194, &c. that the substitution of 110 l. stock carrying THREE AND A HALF *per cent.* for 100 l. carrying THREE *per cent.*, or, in other words, that 20 l. to be received some time hereafter, besides an annuity of 17 s. for the intermediate time, is worth in present money more than 20 l., reckoning compound interest at 4 *per cent.*

Such a scheme, therefore, in whatever way its value was rightly calculated, would appear to offer an advantageous bargain. Should there, however, be reason to fear that the public might judge otherwise; or should the 3 *per cents.* be at 74 or 75, the value might be easily increased near nine *per cent.* by making the substituted stock 112 l. instead of 110 l. in which case, the interest for the 20 l. advanced would become

18 s. 5d. *per ann.*, or a little more than four and a half *per cent.* instead of *four and a quarter.*

The advantages to the public which would arise, from such a scheme, are——1<sup>st</sup>. That it would be one of the best preparations for measures that must some time or other be entered into for putting the public debts into a *fixed* course of redemption. (a)——In consequence of being raised to a higher interest, a considerable part of them would be made capable of being redeemed with more ease and expedition; and for this reason, it is certain that, if there remains a possibility of our escap-  
ing

(a) I mean such a course of redemption as should not be liable to interruption by a war; or, as would be the effect of the establishment of such an unalienable *sinking* fund as has been described in the *Appeal to the Public on the Subject of the National Debt*, and the *Observations on reverfionary Payments*.——Nothing can save us from bankruptcy but such a fund; and were it established, the 3 *per cents.*, when they came to be redeemed, would soon rise to *par*; and, consequently, the obligation implied in this scheme to pay a part of them at *par* would occasion no additional expence. It is, however, so little to be expected, that such a fund will be ever established, that it would have been folly to have made the calculation given above, on any supposition less favourable, than that the 3 *per cents.* will bear the same price after the present war, that they bore after the last; and that we shall go on as we have hitherto done, paying off a *million*, or a *million and a half*, now and then in a time of peace.

ing a public bankruptcy, the time must come when we shall wish all our debts bore a high interest: (b)

Secondly. / A capital of TWO MILLIONS AND A HALF would be saved in raising FIVE MILLIONS. That is; the nation in procuring *five millions* would incur a debt of only *half* that sum; and instead of having a QUARTER or a THIRD *more* to pay at redemption than had been received, it would have ONE HALF *less* to pay.

Thirdly. Such a scheme would keep up public credit; and, by its necessary operation, contribute to carry *itself* into execution. For the advantages attending it being grounded entirely upon the old 3 *per cent.* stocks, few at such a time would chuse to sell them, but many would be induced to buy; and, consequently, their price would be advanced, contrary to the common effect of public loans.—These seem to me advantages so un-

(b) The conversion of a 3 *per cent.* stock into a 3½ *per cent.* stock gives the same advantage in redeeming it, that the power of redeeming it at 85½ for every 100l. would give.—A million *per ann.* surplus would redeem 114 millions and a quarter of the latter stock in the same time, and therefore at the same expence, that it would redeem 100 millions of the former. I suppose here the 3 *per cent.* paid at *par*; and this I have before observed will be found to be necessary should a time (scarcely the object of hope) ever come when government will set itself in earnest and with any effect to pay the public debts.



speakably important, that I cannot but think it would be right to go to some extraordinary expence, in making at least one experiment of this kind. If, in consequence of offering high terms in *one* trial for a small sum, such an experiment should succeed, it might be renewed on lower terms; and the way might be discovered of managing, in the best manner, larger loans on the same plan.—I cannot help thinking indeed, that it would be found that in this way great sums might be raised without creating *any* new capitals, or making any addition to the public debts. I fancy, for instance, that few, when the *3 per cents.* are about 78, would scruple to pay 25*l.* for the conversion of 100*l.* *THREE per cent.* stock into a 100*l.* *FOUR per cent.* stock, provided this last stock was not to become redeemable till THIRTY or FORTY MILLIONS of our present debts, have been discharged: And supposing this true, money for public services would be raised at *4 per cent.* or at an interest nearly as low as possible; and, at the same time, a sum equal to the whole money advanced would be saved. But were it necessary to take for such a substitution 24*l.* or even 23*l.* (that is, to pay about *4½ per cent.* for money) the gain, if our debts are ever to be redeemed, would abundantly overbalance the increased expence of interest.

A  
TIMELY APPEAL  
TO THE  
COMMON SENSE  
OF THE  
PEOPLE OF GREAT BRITAIN  
IN GENERAL,  
AND OF THE  
INHABITANTS OF BUCKINGHAMSHIRE  
, IN PARTICULAR,  
ON THE  
PRESENT SITUATION OF AFFAIRS;  
WITH REFERENCES TO THE OPINIONS OF MOST OF  
THE BRITISH AND FRENCH PHILOSOPHERS  
OF THE PRESENT CENTURY. •

---

By J. PENN, Esq  
SHERIFF OF BUCKINGHAMSHIRE.

---

LONDON:  
PRINTED FOR J. HATCHARD, NO. 173, PICCADILLY.



TO THE  
HON. AND RIGHT REVEREND  
WILLIAM STUART,  
LORD BISHOP OF ST. DAVID'S.

MY LORD,

THE general esteem you have derived from your acknowledged exemplary character, and liberality of sentiment, and your sacred function, to which the interests of religion are particularly intrusted, are the reasons which induce me to dedicate to you the present moral and political Work. In doing which I embrace, with the utmost satisfaction, the opportunity

DEDICATION.

of expressing myself with great regard and esteem,

MY LORD,

Your affectionate brother, and  
very sincere friend,

J. PENN.

## TIMELY APPEAL

---

THERE IS this difference between the generality of sciences and politics (which is necessarily connected with all possible modes of life, and which only attains complete glory, when its plans for the benefit of the community are founded equally upon all the various interests and dispositions of the individuals in it), that should any superficial *reader* risk a discovery of ignorance by discoursing upon the former, a motive of vanity *might* deservedly be imputed to him; but should any inhabitant of a free country, who is neither a public man, nor one depending for his happiness upon the animation of party struggles, in some cases express his sentiments on the latter, there might be danger, lest he who accused him of the motive, should himself incur suspicion of it. The answer might be, “you talk with great diffuseness and apparent knowledge,

upon the subject of abstract rights; your doctrines, I take it for granted, are not at war with Rousseau's, and your arguments are perhaps, on examination, logically deduced from specific premises, as they are certainly delivered with confidence, and with fluency. I see, however, little use in the farther consideration of them; for the truth is, that while you, though elegantly, expatiate in praise of philanthropy, and its supposed necessary attendant, peace, I experience sensations dissuasive of my agreement with you, too powerful for utterance—while you talk, I feel. Though music itself furnishes no succession of sounds more tunable than a benevolent general sentiment, yet while I consider the particular case to which you apply it; while I perceive your boasted toleration to aim at the destruction of a mode of worship nowise interfering with yours, and your boasted Christian tenets, to seek the extirpation of those who profess it, wishing you peace and prosperity, at the same time that you strive to lay our common country at the feet of an insulting enemy; I cannot repent my emphatic censure of such an ill-timed want of unanimity. On the contrary, I am more and more confirmed in my resolution

to beware even of sounds that may prove plausibly deceitful, and firmly and manfully, though conscientiously, adhere to the same set of men and measures, till one grand point be gained, as seeing no other possible means of rescuing ourselves and our posterity, equally with all the other inhabitants of the globe, from the wretched and ignominious fate which threatens us. If you tell me, therefore, I cannot be free, and knowing; I answer, I will be free, and ignorant."

Reflections of this nature have so far at least overcome the repugnance which I share with many, to the idea of submitting political opinions thus formally to the public, as to induce me to try the value of any hints which I may owe to reading and observation, while I collect together into one comprehensive view the different topics which are now most interesting, with the advantage of every new light hitherto thrown upon them by others.

For this purpose I shall consider the chief objects of popular discontent, which have existed during the present war, beginning naturally with the least rational: for as during the course of it the political frenzy it fixed has considerably abated,



though unfortunately the dangers it occasioned have by no means lessened in the same proportion, they will be properly enumerated and examined in the order of time, which is the following :

1. The restraints of religion and morality ;
- 2, the unequal distribution of wealth ; 3, inequality of rank ; 4, the severity of our penal code, as understood by modern philosophers ; 5. disregard of the good will expressed for us by the French ; 6, religious establishments ; 7, partial representation ; 8, the imperfect diffusion of knowledge ; 9, indisposition to peace ; 10, the weight of taxes ; 11, the discouragements of agriculture ; 12, restrictions of trade ; 13, the distresses of the poor ; 14, ministerial influence ; 15, and finally, that attachment to persons as well as things, usefully, as I contend, endeared to us both by intrinsic merit and antiquity.

I. The advantage which the weak in every society derive from the laws of morality, appears at the present time sufficient to convince all of their use. It is rather to be wished, that they should enjoy still more freedom from violence and rapacity ; while the strong, who often unintentionally

injure them, may have a career opened to their thoughtless activity, in which they need not apprehend harm either to themselves or others. A state of peace and quiet is favourable to such moral and political discoveries as are to be expected from enlightened men. But *in the mean time* there is not that hurry for enlarging the bounds of luxurious enjoyment. The privileges of right ought only to be received and deemed valid, when the commands of duty are obeyed. It is however to be hoped, that whatever impediment every man now feels to the free and satisfactory use of his faculties, for the attainment of happiness, will by degrees be either wholly or in great part removed; but that moralist seems to me most likely to remove any, who, allowing for the variety of human disposition, is,

To virtue only, and her friends a friend;

who can favour equally the love of ease and action; the passions of youth and age; the bounded pride (if it may be called pride) of honour, and the principled acquiescences of humility; and who does not fear the fate of pleasing no one by respecting

the interests of all, when the construction of a divine command is left to men ; because he is persuaded that, at that time, whatever rights are left to them, after the performance of duties, are for the equal gratification of all ; and that it is only doing common justice to be a moderator between different descriptions of men, rather than a partizan of any single one.

The moralist, thus relying more on sympathy and common sense, than an accurate knowledge of moral theories, or even an incautious and indiscriminating originality of remark, would require being favoured in his views by continued perseverance in loyal conduct ; which would permit our envied constitution to operate the desired change uninterruptedly ; without undoing, at intervals, by popular commotions, what had taken years of peace and industry to effect. This loyal conduct, I think, at this time, would be encouraged by nothing more than having decent habits of life always protected by the clergy from the imputation of Pharisaic hypocrisy. I will confess, that we ought not to see a strong contrast between a man's actions as they appear, and as they are ; nor are crimes and piety

of a congenial nature. But hypocrisy itself is not meaner than an unbounded suspicion of it ; and, on another occasion, Voltaire confesses,

*Quiconque est soupçonneux, invite à le trahir.*

To reap the fruits therefore of deceit, or even try to deceive, is hypocrisy ; but to prevent the bad influence of our example on society, when we know we are, or think we may be, wrong ; and that by holding up no impenetrable veil before the eyes of individuals, may easily be conceived to result from the most sublime virtue ; even were it not liable to be so unfavourably represented. I may, perhaps, go farther than some in the avowal I am about to make ; but I think Christian charity dictates it ; and when we have proceeded to the utmost bounds of liberality, all the trouble and danger of the approach is over. I am one of those who think the tenets of that sect in France, which has lately shocked the world, of the most absurd, incomprehensible sort ; yet I am hitherto firmly of opinion, that, as it is the heart and intentions which are pleasing, or otherwise, to the Deity, and those are generally made known by some overt act of virtue or vice, or else

not at all, one belonging to it, accustomed to keep to himself sentiments which might to any one of his greatest comfort, would be respectable in setting an example of regularity, and at the same time receiving instruction so necessary to him, at church. We find in the Scriptures, "the fool hath said in his heart, there is no God:"—therefore, where Atheism exists only in the heart, and not in the conversation or writings of a man, it is, supposing in him a love of truth, only folly and weakness; and this it might be, in one respect, though he had the mind of Newton; for it is even observed, according to a usual saying, that the most sensible persons often act the most foolishly. But, if he became a preaching Sadducee, actuated by a mean love of proselytism, his doctrine would have deserved, not contempt, but abhorrence. I cannot but think, from some expressions of Butler, and other writers of the Church of England, that they would approve of this "unlimited charity." Voltaire, and after him Robespierre, might have made an intolerant distinction, favourable to a sect, which gives no certain hopes of immortality; but it is wonderful that timid Christians, assailed on all

sides by philosophers, should seem thoughtlessly introducing Deism by a compromise, and part with half their liberality, that half the truth may be universally established. But when charitable opinions so prevail, that bigotry itself cannot retract them, all persons will be induced to entertain respect for Christianity; and knowing their rights to fair reputation, not secretly, but openly allowed, will approve of Mr. Paley's plan of teaching morality, by referring to Scripture authority, rather than that of Hume, by separating the sanctions. All might equally then throw light upon morality, according to their powers, on receiving their data from the Christian philosopher; and as the light of nature coincides with that of revelation, they would thus forward the most important part of their own views, while their reasoning would never appear poisoned by their opinions.

The question, therefore, seems not to be, whether habits useful to society may not be formed by Atheists, but whether they do not entertain opinions which are false, and which, if successfully propagated, will ravish from mankind prospects of happiness, compared to which, all others are of

contemptible value. If the habits of all sects are upon a par, we shall necessarily prefer those opinions which are *the truest, and the least prejudicial*. If immorality is made the test of Atheism, there will be perpetual *danger* of morality; though, if the professors of it were always the best men in the state, it could not invalidate a single argument in favour of the *truth* of Christianity. Were I asked, therefore, what appeared to me the best mode of uniting faith and charity in this respect, I should say, " Let every peasant be taught the truth, let him be persuaded that the doctrines complained of will have fewer and fewer advocates every day; but let him know, at the same time, that it is a consequence of science and philosophy, which must ever remain in themselves a blessing to mankind, that our faculties are sometimes overstrained in the active pursuit of truth, and do not always perform their functions equally well; and that, among those he sees conforming to the rules of life, and refraining from the obtrusion of extraordinary sentiments upon the public, there may be a few who entertain momentary doubts of religion; but that, if there were none, truth being (in this

sense at least) eternal and immutable, would equally render it just, that he should think pity rather than horror due to any whose existence is but imagined."

When this sort of half expectation is understood to be in the minds of all, no treachery, falsehood, or hypocrisy, can be perceived in that modesty which neither is urged to deny, nor strives to publish, a particular mode of thinking. A person may grow attached, and be assistant, to the cause of that religion to which he gives only a limited credit, and it is possible that such a prepossession may so act upon his mind, and so conspire with that *perpetual* endeavour I suppose in him to find out the truth, that, if he is well treated by his countrymen, and allowed credit according to his conscientious actions, he may sooner or later become a convert to their opinions. He may then be struck with the difference of the Heathen and Christian religions. He will again revolve in his mind what he had thought before, that there needs no hypocrisy in professing to believe what the wisest of all philosophers had done: and will confess that he deserved not the epithet of *wicked*, but that of *weak*. I cannot conceive I have a right to



question the morality of sectaries who neither justify, nor are guilty of, immoral actions. If that is done, the generous believer will be tempted to conceal his sentiments, in order to make common cause with the oppressed.

As to accusing even persons of a right way of thinking of hypocrisy, for decent though direct behaviour, it is surely vastly more unfavourable to the cause of loyalty; and the more unjust, as our country has exclusive reasons to abstain from adopting a suspicious conduct. It is contrary to the spirit both of that English jurisprudence, which makes proof necessary, and of that English philosophy, which requires demonstration; and there is no true English heart insensible to its injurious consequences.

II. It is a matter of just astonishment, how the idea of a community living on property divided equally among its members, can have been thought to have a greater connection with *nature* than another. It is precisely from its being in the extreme unnatural, that I disapprove of it. When men have emerged from that state of society in which every

one supplies his own wants, barter becomes more and more habitual ; and a uniform and systematic intercourse begins to establish itself ; which is exactly the same among nations who are each other's antipodes, and wholly ignorant of each other's existence. A change from this usual mode of conducting the business of life in any society, must be wrought by the mind, estranging itself either forcibly, or by some new allurements, from certain desires and propensities inherent in human nature : for as the *Roman Catholic monk* prohibits the commerce of the sexes, so the *Protestant monk* preaches against the accumulation of property.

The first object of the statesman ought to be, perhaps, the universal exercise of the faculties of man for the production of virtue and ingenuity ; of virtue for its own sake, and ingenuity for the sake of virtue ; as its well-directed exertions tend, *ad infinitum*, to the enlargement of his views, the more perfect knowledge, and the surer discharge of his moral and religious duties. Wealth therefore is not to be esteemed in itself any more than the ground on which we tread, and which taxes, by a great deal of uncleanly labour, and by tardy production, our property in the fruits of the earth. However there

are no easier means of acquiring them permitted to  
by Providence :

————— Deus ipse colendi

Haud facilem esse viam voluit ; primusque per artem

Movit humum, curis acuens mortalia corda :

Nec torpere gravi passus sua regna veterno.

The eternal Sire, immutably decreed,

That tillage should with toil alone succeed ;

With cares he rouzed, and sharpened human heart,

Brightening the rust of indolence by arts.

WARTON.

And just so it is with rational happiness. We must undergo the difficulties which wealth and trade would impose upon us, in order to command the greatest attainable quantity of rational enjoyment. But a melioration of our condition may be expected from time, experience, and the advantage a succession of able and industrious statesmen will long hence have taken of them. And who can say, that if experiments continue long to be made *upon the same principles*, and without interruption, we shall not arrive at such a knowledge of the nature of man and the power of laws, that wealth may not only be no inconvenience, but possess the same

value in the eyes of the philosopher, as it has now in those of the merchant. All the ingenious and praise-worthy inventions intended to benefit agriculture can neither give labour the power of pleasing, nor cause the earth spontaneously to produce the food of all. The statesman therefore has an advantage. He may (for aught we know) in a course of time lead wealth along such certain channels, and so judiciously, and in so many parts form his dams and sluices, that it will be in no danger of overflowing or disturbing the academic groves; but, on the contrary, glide by them, equally welcome to those who now repine at it, on account of beauty and utility. It may be better therefore not to put nature out of her course. Some virtuous gentlemen lately formed a plan to emigrate, and live in common upon their property. But though I give the same credit to that plan as if it had been really executed, I am induced also to think favourably enough of human nature, to suppose there are many virtuous persons equal to the same sacrifices, if they found a scheme which was feasible, and not more injurious than friendly to the cause of liberty and virtue.

Concerning the advantage wealth appears to have

over competence, I need suggest to few that it may be considered in most respects imaginary; its cares and enjoyments regularly balancing each other; its only real advantage is that slight and superfluous one of power, or command of labour, which, when the mind is otherwise at ease and happy, forms a temptation strong enough to give exercise to its faculties, and to preserve the same degree of industry and activity always in the world. Those persons only can think differently, whom experience and reflection have not taught the true nature of human happiness. It is very possible that affluence should be deprived of its charms by envy, as the alluring viands of the Trojans were rendered unpalatable by the harpies.

III. The arguments against inequality of rank, the supposed natural equality of mankind, is next to be considered. This is what I am far from allowing, though one of those to whom the feelings of an Englishman has rendered pleasing the sound of the expression; and I think it is plain how persons really attached to the Constitution may have appeared favourable to the principle. The free spirit of all such will prompt them to be ever on

the watch for the security and extension of real liberty ; but they may, on consideration, find this conduct very compatible with an opposite mode of thinking. The fact is, I imagine, that the passions of men form a natural *inequality*, which the utmost human wisdom, since the beginning of the world, has found no other means of destroying, than by enacting laws for the regulation of societies, and conferring, in many, peculiar privileges on some of their members ; which laws and privileges keep the whole community, as it were, upon the same level. The friend of liberty is right in striving to make men equal, because they have equal claims ; but his estimate of equality may be founded on a mistake, from his being more easily able to judge of one species of inequality than the opposite, and therefore liable to rush from one extreme into another. But whether the despotism of Turkey, or the anarchy of France, prevails in states, inequality alike exists there, to the disgrace of mankind ; nor does the latter differ essentially from the former. But though I think all men have naturally a right to the utmost possible *true* equality, yet I do not pretend to set bounds to the wisdom that is labouring to establish it, nor to affirm that

what appears to vulgar eyes, to deduct from the liberty of the people; may not, upon a large scale, and in the opinion of the best judges, tend, beyond any other measure whatsoever, to increase it. Aristotle, for instance, might have thought the power, in this country, enough *essentially*, among the middle orders, though his metaphysical readers understand him, perhaps, as not being of that opinion.

IV. On the next point I might very properly dwell more at large, having not only revolved the subject long and frequently in my mind, but considering it, from its nature, more adapted to my situation, as I both possess the estate, and hold the office, in this county, which our great lawyer, Sir Edward Coke, did near two centuries ago. Speculative men have, of late years, reconsidered the justice of capital punishment, and testified repugnance at the severity of our laws, as well as those of other European states. To attempt to render any of their hints productive of a more satisfactory acquiescence in our old sterling code, I feel to be a work of difficulty, and therefore I shall not boast of lights equal to the accomplishment of my aim; though parish

ghost-tales represent the venerable judge as sometimes near enough for pretërnatural admonition. I shall simply, considering him as the Genius of the place, exclaim, *sis bonus*:—and having thus implored his favour, proceed, to the best of my power, in stating my opinions on subjects, which must by time, in spite of the gathering glooms of false philosophy, have had light thrown upon them, in addition to what they owed to him, and to the age in which he lived.

It has long appeared, to me, as well as to many, that if complaints are persevered in, tending to mitigate the severity of our penal laws, there is a medium to stop at which has more to recommend it than any other. Before the question of abrogating all punishment is discussed, may we not naturally bestow a thought on the propriety of disallowing circumstantial evidence, or allowing it as an exception to a rule, which might be one excellent means of distinguishing character. This possibly may rank with those just reasons for favouring it, which I have myself perceived to weigh with some of our excellent judges, and impartial juries. Though justice ought equally to be done to every character, yet when



mercy is the question, it may be well to consider that if a person who has been often blameable is condemned, he will esteem punishment the lighter, as being a retribution for all his past misdeeds ; but the horror may easily be conceived of him who is condemned to death and infamy, and has passed a life of innocence. I know these matters are looked into with more penetration than I can boast ; but I would only wish in such cases, that we should put in full view the distinction between positive and circumstantial proof. The country might at the same moment shew its sound philosophy and humanity, if the sentence of the law could always rest upon demonstrative certainty ; an expression which, in these theoretic times, cannot too often be repeated ; as it may render us more circumspect in what we undertake, and at once safer and more useful members of society. On circumstantial proof, therefore, I wish our eyes to be fixed, since, if lenity increases, it ought at least to begin in this rational way. Experiments might then be made from time to time, in order to try our power of dispensing with its assistance. And it is impossible to say how far the improvement of the police, united with the vigilance of the magistrates, may, in a course of years, tend

to counteract any unfortunate consequences of this courageous mildness. But I would not yet proceed further, nor venture upon such untried experiments, either as the philosophers of the present day, or even a Beccaria would recommend.

However, I differ from most of the writers on crimes and punishments, in being of opinion, that we ought not to lay much stress in discussing the subject, on the preventive nature of the latter; nor publish, at every opportunity, our reliance on intimidation. A beast is insensible to the disgrace of being goaded into the right path; but a man can reflect. Nor can it be thought an unsound doctrine that we ought to look chiefly to a sense of moral and religious duty, and a consciousness of the dignity of human nature, for obedience to the laws, if the power of punishment is, secretly, no less kept in our hands. Firmness, united with delicacy, the *suaviter in modo, et fortiter in re*, would thus be exemplified. I would consider execution as a mere means of forming a scale to estimate crimes, and as less a punishment, than the shame attending it. For if a man is allowed to respect himself, he has an additional incentive to good actions; and in this free country, the poor ought to be so; for I think,

on this very account, they would be more assistant in the work, so often necessary, of strengthening the hands of Government.

My prejudice against fear, as a debasing motive of conduct, has led me also to entertain the opinions I am about to describe. In a work \* of a very different nature from the present, I mentioned being struck at the first knowledge I had of an experiment that has been lately made. In the Reports of the Society for bettering the Condition of the Poor, it will appear to have been made by my noble relation the Earl of Winchilsea; and the success of his active and benevolent exertions, is sufficient both to claim and to attract the notice of every person of occasional reflection. On learning that this plan of indulgence to cottagers was understood by some members of the Society as relating chiefly to the most meritorious, I was led to form an awful sort of comparison in my mind. I considered that mankind had abstained, perhaps culpably, from following the example of the Deity, in not, like him, inciting to virtue both by reward and punishment, but confining itself, less humanely, to the latter. A system of

proportioning favour to merit, already found practicable, was much, I thought, to be preferred to hazardous innovations, which, in fact, by neither rewarding nor punishing, depart in all respects from the great example we are enjoined to follow. I conceived, therefore, that the real light of discovery was beginning to dawn upon the world, and that this country, which had led the way to its improvement in other instances, was now preparing for it the blessings of a more perfect jurisprudence. Some persons incline to suppose the Deity laying a greater stress on reward than punishment. This, therefore, would farther justify our endeavour, by favouring the most meritorious poor in every district, to render daily less and less severity indispensable in the execution of the laws. So much, at least, is certain, that neither harm or danger can result from it to the community. On the contrary, the effect of kind treatment and forbearance on the generality of the lower orders, begins now to be sufficiently understood; and when these are exactly proportioned to desert, we may easily conceive much greater the addition of benefit to society.

Following this train of thought, and observing

the encouragement of particular qualities to promote virtue already recommended, I was led to question the propriety of a sort of punishment experienced equally by all ranks of people ; namely, censure of faults ; and to conceive that it ought to exist in no other form than praise of excellencies. I would ask, how either the English constitution or the interest of any Englishman, could suffer, if no vice were ever made the topic of scandal and abuse ; but that people, instead of slandering the vicious (which seems to argue such spotless purity in themselves), took occasion to double their attention to persons generally known to have made more or less sacrifices to duty ? All the difference caused by such a plan would be a greater number of acts of kindness in the world, and its consequence the establishment of a scale calculated to inform the judgments of those who want no other motive to act in a manner every way becoming themselves. It is not by checking sentiments of benevolence towards a prodigal son ; but by disproving a particular attachment to his worst qualities, that prodigality can be prevented. Inform his reason, by shewing more countenance and admiration of opposite, unless

he has more good than bad ones, and the universal passion will direct him another way. Till then nature will be obeyed, and it is almost condemning him by an *ex post facto* law, to suppose that he will act differently. The same reasoning holds good of other faults. In what manner to form this scale, which would not dispute the possession of goodness, but only distinguish its various degrees, is the next consideration. The more excellence of every kind a person possesses, the greater claim he has for praise and favour; but to what character, considered singly, ought we to give the preference? Now it may be natural to prefer one, and politic to prefer another. The custom of pressing is adopted as politic by a free government, and many measures are forced upon us by the difficulty of conducting the affairs of life. The compliment, too, of marking out for veneration a particular description of persons, need less excite jealousy, if we reflect that the inhabitants of the Alps esteem idiots the favourites of heaven, and (nobly, I think, and generously) shew respect to that helpless race of men. I consider it in the manner I propose, as the only method of gradually curing that fever of the

mind, which is produced by an excessive longing for the reputation of active virtue, and which has been particularly epidemical during these last twenty years. In that time the minds of our youth have been so much inflamed and agitated by the moral systems in fashion, co-operating with the revolutions of states, that we are on all sides threatened with legislation, on the ruin of existing institutions, and have to *tremble* at the zeal of competitors for present or future glory, as patriots and philosophers. I now proceed to mention that character or collection of qualities, which, denudated and separated from every thing extraneous, I conceive most politic, though not most agreeable, to encourage by increased favour. Genuine merits of a stimulative nature, the effect of which alone is sensible to ordinary minds, more readily find their reward in the world; but the case is different of a character without either fault on one hand, or pretence on the other, with a disposition equal to every sacrifice, but who, wanting powers and talents, has never found or created an opportunity for striking exertion; and though, both in public and private life, he is solely influenced by a sense of duty, yet transfers his

activity to the laws, and by not opposing, becomes useful through their means. It should particularly be noticed, that in this character which, *singly considered*, I should recommend as an object of favour, I suppose manners, *unintentionally* repulsive and unpleasant; for I have stripped it of every thing that is not its peculiar property. Its sensibility I suppose unseen and denied by the world, from that

———tardiness of nature,  
Which often leaves the history untold  
It did intend to do.

A defect perhaps more common than is generally allowed. It is necessary to make this distinction; for supposing the addition of *practicable* manners, which give a claim to one degree more of encouragement, all the difference is naturally made between liking and disliking. The chief difference, however, which ought to made, is that of assorting or not assorting much with the character; for there is no moral obligation to make any part of our time pass disagreeably. Such is the power of mere practicable manners, that it is natural for persons of serious dispositions, who are interestedly yet fairly



attracted by them, to flatter themselves it is the virtuous part of a friend's character they admire, and to despise in others, as vain, all those honourable claims of brilliant colloquial or other talents which contribute to the ornament of society. Friendship, indeed, levels all distinctions; but smaller ones inclusive, estimating the man unbribed by any of his qualities. Though it may justly seek interested pleasure, and though a similarity of disposition may reasonably direct us in the choice of friends, suitably to Cicero's treatise, yet to insist always on union of sentiment, is not favourable to liberality. On the contrary, where friends are not of a wavering character, but can act against each other with steadiness and energy, their even taking different sides in politics, though attended with inconveniences, may have a conciliating influence upon party spirit. But the character I have described appears to me that, where friendship ought both to begin and end; the present *or expected* possession of the qualities, which compose that character, seeming to justify us both in making and retaining friends. Every thing of pretence which is good, as wisdom, generosity, courage in men

and beauty in women, is consistent with, though not necessary to it; and every thing which is bad, as the placing those advantages or others above right and justice, is totally uncongenial with it. This reverence for *passive virtue* appears to me at this moment almost indispensable, as a means of reducing to their former calm and rational state, the minds of men,

“ Puff'd up with high conceits, engendering pride.”

and whose faculties “ strained to the height” by the maddening contemplation of impracticable theories, call loudly upon us to favour their repose. It is held that the Christian religion inculcates active virtue; and so it indisputably does: but I have found no reason to think active may not be considered as subordinate, and secondary to passive virtue. Why it is not, I have in part considered already. In the case of generosity, the immediate advantage derived from it by individuals, makes them comparatively insensible to the merit of mere probity; which, till the world is much more polished, will not obtain a just proportion of regard. Yet much may probably be done by people's permitting their imaginations to supply in

useful continued forbearance that interest which is of itself perceived in useful transitory exertion. To an undepraved taste this must be easier ; and, as I have observed before, no channel of benevolence need be deserted to carry nutriment where it was required ; but only new streams salutarily called into being. The mechanism which produces them, will form an employment, and an employment is frequently a pleasure. It may be as good a mode as any other of "dissipating *ennui*. But in whatever manner this scale is formed, that which is allowed virtue should confer respect according to its quantity ; nor ought any additional portion of it to fail of receiving additional praise. It is true, that the utmost degree of it should not be most insisted upon in proposing an example, as a smaller degree must appear more attainable, and encourage more persons to the endeavour of acquiring it. But the general principle of Diogenes\* appears to me in all cases good ; namely, that greater rational strictness than is usually submitted to, should be at least *recommended* by the moralist, in order to allow for the failure of human weakness ; as the note which proceeded from the leader of a musical band was the highest.

\* See Brucker, tom. I. p. 868.

that the other musicians might not sink below the proper key. How it is consistent to prefer one degree of virtue as an example, and a superior degree upon the whole, it is easy to conceive. In like manner, in a court of justice the great stress is laid upon what is sufficient evidence of a fact, though the concurrence of two or more witnesses corroborates the proof. It may therefore be advisable to prefer the best, but praise him most for so much merit as shews him only *somewhat* better than the generality.

Having been lately engaged in a literary pursuit, unconnected with politics and morals, which has shewn to me, in another instance, the propriety of a scale of merit, resolutely formed and preserved, but not too rigorously insisted on, I may plead my peculiar consistency in extenuation of any too sentimental strain of writing. I have been uniformly of opinion, that laws and rules were too much considered as severe judges, when they ought to be, and to appear, only wise counsellors. This scale of merit ought to be held close to every eye; but that habitual censure, at least, which waits for neither wit, gaiety, nor feeling, ought to be distinguished

by no ear. When the fault is great, censure irritates its object, and renders odious the virtuous principles of its author ; and when it is small, objection, carried farther than custom and conversation require, shocks as unjust, and is the most adverse of any thing to the formation of such a scale of merit as would improve the heart through the medium of the understanding. How often is one who, without meaning to introduce bad taste into manners, expresses himself, from a constitutional defect, with stiffness and formality, sneered at as a coxcomb ; in which case all the deceit of studied affectation is attributed to him ? On the contrary, the custom of blaming one quality by praising its opposite, which is adopted in practice and conversation, deserves applause ; and, where not offensive by pointedness, may be carried to the length of rewarding every particle of desert. For it is vanity, that either in morals or literature, makes us speak contemptuously of abstract excellence. Unable, as we are, to be perfect, we allow and encourage no other idea of perfection than that to which our powers and passions are adequate. It does not, however, so much concern us to be reputed without

fault, that we should not otherwise relish the estimation we are held in for doing merely as well as we can? Christian humility, as much as common-sense, forbids our boasting of superior purity, and not subscribing to the character, as far as it is clearly proved, of our conduct, even though it should be an acknowledgment of inferiority to others. It is therefore unjustifiable, by stickling for much good opinion, to impair the standard of merit; or to be above looking up to perfection, as resolved to see it only on a level with us.

Justice has been a pretext for the commission of so many crimes, that it is at present a bugbear to moralists; and the acknowledged merit of Christian patience and resignation may tend to alienate the mind still more from it, and make injury appear the less unamiable, as a means of exercising those virtues. But I believe justice is as often enjoined by the Scriptures as any virtue; and it seems equitable, that as men have different habits and prejudices, no one system should be preferred with that confidence which inspires a contempt of others. Revenge and extreme retaliation are the teeth and claws of justice: let them be drawn, and the worst

that can be said of it will be, that it is inoffensive. But their very connection with it ought rather to be denied. If in the definition of justice the idea of revenge is made to appear incompatible with it, to impute to the former the crimes of the latter would be impossible.

When I mention praise as a reward of good actions, I would not be supposed to esteem it a positive good. It is, in my opinion, of the nature of a bond, which does not necessarily satisfy a just demand, but only manifests a title to property, and, in most cases, renders it more secure. But that which is sometimes given, particularly when passive virtue is its object, too frequently resembles a depreciated assignat, received as equal to its nominal value. The insult, added to injury, of saying that virtue is its own reward, and expecting therefore the object of praise to think himself overpaid by fine words, is like that of filling vain proclamations with boasts of favour conferred by acts of real tyranny. Yet are those deserving of praise, by an affectation of liberality, often among the first to express themselves satisfied with its airy diet; as if the greatest ambition of a man should be to resemble a came-

Icon. If, instead of this, the same persons were to strive moderately to acquire, and the world chose to award, the gifts of fortune, or favour of individuals as their recompence, and always guard them from the odium they excite, their situation, and of course the merit which had earned it, would become generally desirable. But a common insight into human nature must discover to us, that when praise is coupled with an alienation of mind, produced by coldness, the more profusely it is bestowed, the more it may shock its object, as given in lieu of essential services ; in the same manner as it made the crow in the fable look silly, by inducing it to drop its food. It is, however, often difficult to know when the due degree of justice is withheld ; Pope says well,

How dar'st thou let one honest man, be poor ?

which indeed is exactly the sentiment I would recommend. But at this time, in particular, people will be too much disposed to suspect the motives of those, who cannot see the propriety or even justice of some act of generosity they are urged to, and in consequence will think they fairly may put the



Question to them. Nothing likewise is more common than to imagine either Government or individuals to have the choice of granting or withholding the reward due to merit, and to prefer the latter. But, before this inference is made from the acts of either, we ought to be perfectly sure they have found no impediments they themselves regret to the performance of what we desire. We do not enough wait for unequivocal marks of neglect, before we testify discontent. When a favour, manifestly easy to be granted, is declined, or when a large part of life passes without an opportunity for any being successfully sought, there will be much more reason for a return of complaint and opposition.

If any one dislikes the scale I wish adopted, from an idea of its not discountenancing all regard to ourselves, and our own enjoyments, I shall observe that the spirit of excessive philanthropy, in fact, appears quite as much connected with selfishness; only as a plain man considers self what the word imports, and makes his fellow-creatures objects of his generosity; so the philanthropist, allowing only the happiness of others to be of consequence, is quite sufficiently *generous* to himself. All the difference

between them is, that the former, in calling things by their proper names, manifests a regard to truth and modesty ; for nature will assert her rights ; and indeed there would be a singular absurdity in its happening otherwise. Suppose A B C D to represent the human race, composed of individuals, each of whom confesses no other object nor desire but the well being of the rest. A, therefore, is quite indifferent to himself, but made up of sympathy for B, C, and D. B likewise possessing the same principles, dreams of nothing but the prosperity of A, C, and D. C is not behind hand, but the interests of A, B, and D engross his whole time and attention ; and D acts with reciprocal disinterestedness and benevolence towards A, B, and C. When zeal is loudly professed, its inefficacy is a matter of regret to more hearers ; and yet I cannot but be at a loss to find not only who is to receive benefit of persons so indifferent to their own welfare ; but, this being the fact, and known to be so by themselves, why they still continue their fruitless endeavours to confer it. I truly hope, that in the next century the “ Hutcheson jargon” \* will cease to disgust reflecting

\* This was Gray's expression, (see Memoirs, sect. iv.

minds; or, at least, that it may be allowed, in the words of Pope, that

— — Self-love becomes, by force divine,  
The scale to measure other's wants by thine.

I can easily conceive persons to feel acutely for others, not upon the selfish principle of the Epicurean sect; for we all have had reason to do so lately, for the unfortunate Irish victims: I can conceive too, that, after making up his mind, it will, on some occasions, be natural for a man to be extremely ready to risk his life, however great the danger; but I cannot conceive that any person constantly considers himself only as excellent food for powder, or has no more regard to his own hap-

lett. 2.) who so long ago felt that disgust which many now feel, at the modern cant of philosophy. "It may be said of him, as Sir Walter Raleigh says of Pindar, that "he was one of the wisest." It is strange that Adam Smith should see affectation in trading only for the sake of our country, and not in aiming only at the happiness of others, according to the system of his admired Hutcheson. In order to steer exactly between this affectation, and too great avidity of gain, it might be well to consider the pursuit of our interest as a *favourite amusement*; not however of others, but ourselves.

piness than that of insects or reptiles, merely because our neighbour may be considered as having a separate interest from ourselves. Every person feels pain *somewhat* more immediately, when it is inflicted upon himself than his neighbour; and therefore his expressing extraordinary contempt for his own pleasures, may be acknowledged absurd, even before it is proved so by his contradictory interestedness.

The religious need not be scandalized at this species of scale, because it may appear regulated by a love of earthly enjoyments. We do not object to a similar scale, less carefully indeed graduated, but which still exists; and a preference of which does not argue greater mildness. We are willing that a love of life, and of course its pleasures, should operate to prevent flagrant crimes; and for this end are content that numbers annually should expiate their transgressions at the gallows. Besides superior mildness, this plan has the advantage of extending its beneficial influence to all ranks in the community, and to those parts of human conduct over which the law has no power.

There is therefore no impropriety in confessing

that we retain the dispositions we were born with, and have a relish for the favour and esteem of the world. It is only necessary that we should be independent of those advantages, and never deviate, for their sake, from the true line of duty. It is ever to be regretted that even the least ingratiating should have to look back upon a life disgraced not only by the want of very attached intimates, which would be natural, but by principled friends, who would, at least, never wholly desert their interests. Should the judicious management of esteem be ever relied upon to improve society, this will be prevented; or when it has happened, be remedied. If, indeed, it is thought wrong to compose a copy of verses, transgressing poetical justice, should it not also, to produce the great poem of life in like manner defective. There is no reason in one case, which is not perceivable in the other, why a virtuous course of conduct should not be encouraged by making it appear favoured by the Deity. True disinterestedness in a man's actions is *general*, but not *universal*. He should be able to make every sacrifice, but should except such enjoyments and advantages from those he does make, as by their nature are calculated

to attract attention; and represent him as an example of merit successful, or, at least, not unfortunate. It is to be wished no ruling passion may direct his choice to other enjoyments and advantages; which might add to the number of unedifying reverses of fortune, and undeserved successes, in the world. If any person value himself for leniency, in despising this tacit use of a scale of merit, which will be the more effectual, as it is more natural and less invidious, I again desire him to recollect that he now resorts to *the balter*. It is very true, that the Christian religion enjoins patience under affliction; but is it extraordinarily prudent to institute perpetual trials of it, which only multiply examples of virtue by discouraging from the pursuit of it? A man's whole life ought to be considered together, in order to estimate him; otherwise a proof of virtue is a mere proof of mental or constitutional powers, exerted on the spur of the occasion. There are peculiar slight weaknesses in most men, which are so natural, that very likely their virtues are partly owing to the public's indulgence of them. Persons fond of crossing the man who least deserves it, with a view of rendering his life more of a probation, need to be

upon their guard, lest their propensity should degenerate into a depraved love of seeing virtue abased, and vice triumphant. On the contrary, how do we know, that for every person of rare virtue, without other recommendations, whom we particularly favour, we may not ultimately save one, unknown to us, from the gallows? This conduct too is the more glorious and truly moral, as virtue never forces from us its just reward, but vice often degrades, by bullying us out of what it has no right to. People profess too much to be careless of what is said of them, and by letting the world talk, as the expression is, imprudently inure the mind to censure; though it may be very possible for a person, careless of the censure of all, except a few, to attach so great a value to their esteem, as to sacrifice to it that worth, for which esteem is properly given. But it is not for themselves but the world at large, that they should cherish a love of esteem, and by consequently discouraging the obstreperous clamours of censure, permit mankind to attend to the distinctions of qualities and characters. Censure directed against the spirit of censure, is laudable, for the same reason that at other times it deserves disapprobation. It is

then a negation of the merit of that which is a negation of merit; and tends to destroy its force; yet if it perpetually appeals to reason, instead of declaiming with the pomp of moral self-sufficiency; even though its warmth betrays indignation at absurdity, it will appear momentary, and not of that habitual sort which characterizes modern philanthropy. The contemplation of the gloomy objects of censure, at such times, will resemble the view of an unwholesome and unsightly swamp, half veiled with mists, and overshadowed with clouds; which, while something passes there interesting to us, we have no objection to look upon; but when that is over, we immediately turn, and afterwards constantly keep our eyes in preference upon a part of the country where it has cleared up, and which banishes discontent and suspicion by an enchanting combination of all the fair varieties of nature. My censure, however, has chiefly had censure in view. I do not say, its similar object has always been alike objectionable. Those whose business it is to blame or praise, are obliged to express their *real* sentiments; and when I have written in opposition to them, it has been generally with a view of continuing what I thought a useful controversy.



Upon the whole, I am of opinion, that it would be serviceable to mankind to determine that, as health, a contented disposition, and the means of subsistence, are a full half of every sort of happiness, and render envy absurd; so that no very uncommon character I have described, possessing every degree of abilities, though often under-rated when it possesses the lowest, has a full half, as such, of every sort of human merit. This would put an end to the vanity that makes outrageous distinctions between different minds, at the same time that justice would be done to all endowments. But because this character has a priority of claim to esteem, it does not follow that it should possess proportionate *reward*; and that active virtue and talents should not receive more. This is very consistent with the scale; for what is given is a bare satisfaction for their services. If to him whose prodigality is his striking quality, unusual generosity can be due, because opposition to the benevolent dictates of nature is wrong, surely to him who is distinguished by useful and honourable exertions, whatever can be reasonably expected ought to be readily offered. The superb monuments which are erected in honour of great men are no less to be considered as raised on

their account, than our own : for though part of our object is to show gratitude to them, yet what is chiefly intended is to make clear to the human understanding the nature of every excellence, in order to direct its energy to the improvement of our country, and of mankind ; and in order to bespeak the favour of the unenterprising towards its efforts, as being more for the interest of none than themselves. For the expectations of talents and exertion resemble those of extreme hunger ; which does not necessarily call for attachment in those who can satisfy it ; yet they deserve the appellation of *silly coxcombs* who delay to do so, from a singular idea of fitness and propriety, and with a view of observing the patience discernible in the physiognomy of the suffering person. Passive virtue, therefore, or forbearance, ought perhaps to be nourished, as the root from whence active virtue and all exertion would best spring. Too much professed respect to talents, for instance, by supplying them with favour to promote their interests, takes away all temptation to exert themselves usefully to society. They ought only to insist on not being calumniated by ranking in a proscription with crimes, and not having that career shut upon them which was opened by the hand of God. I have ever held that to op-

pose one moral system to another, within the bounds of moderation, must be serviceable by preventing an acquiescence in the corruptions of either; but it will be remembered, I have at present a particular object, in pursuing which I consider myself as not having forfeited my title to the motto of *MERCY JUSTICE*, which has stood under the arms of Pennsylvania during its provincial state, and for the space of a century; and which I would willingly have a right to consider, both in a literal and figurative sense, to be *my own*.

V. The supposed fondness of the present French for our nation is next to be considered: for though the present year will have undeceived many for a time, who thought them destined to be our eternal admirers, it may not be long before such persons relapse into their former prejudices. But allowing that while the French are *enlightened* by republicanism, they may think justly enough to continue in sincere amity with us, let us only reflect upon the force of example, and the instability of human affairs. There are certainly many of the Aristocratic *faction* even in France, and the French armies are spread over a wide extent of country, and living among peopl

esteemed the most superstitious of Europe. Suppose that in a spirit of kindness to our present enemies we had disarmed, and that the *unfortunate* influence of priests and nobles had operated a change in their principles, while we remained unprepared against the consequences. Or, above all, suppose the *Pope of Rome* were to cross them flying from his ancient dominions, and, like a comet, to shake Babylonish contamination from his flaming robe; they who were just now so filled with sentiments of *pure* benevolence, that they could not tolerate any thing wrong in countries the least connected with their own, would suddenly be inspired with an interest-*edness ever* attached to old systems. How dreadful then would be the consequence! we might be ruled by the iron sceptre of a feudal tyrant, and Astrea, driven from France and the Continent, where her presence is now *bailed so rapturously*, would be unable even to skulk in Britain in the cells of a Corresponding Society.

VI. All arguments do not appear to me exhausted in favour of Church Establishments; and as they have been so much the butt of the enemies of Government, owing to an idea of an alliance with superstition, I

have wondered at it. If we can picture to ourselves that horrid state of things, which would be exhibited by a country without religion, yet even then an order similar to the clergy will appear most strictly consonant to reason, or rather to consistent frenzy. In every country, the care of its archives, the superintendence of education, or the cultivation of the science of morality, and attention to its interests, are matters of peculiar moment, from their serious nature. Objects, therefore, of this sort, even alone, having a character very different from more general ones, may naturally prompt a nation to confer separate dignity on persons whose business it is to promote them. Importance rather claims distinction than disregard; and every argument, but the more absurd ones drawn from theology, justifies this mode of conferring it, upon general principles, and consistent with the just ultimate views of the wildest sectaries. Whoever acknowledges the importance of such serious concerns, may think, especially in new countries, too much deference shewn them, but must applaud the circumstance of shewing them some deference in the formation of a church establishment, and see besides that *one sect is intended as much to benefit from its principle as another.*

There is something very dignified in the circumstance of persons whose business it is to be versed in morality, forming a part of the senate, in order, as other members give their opinions upon the law of the land, to shew how that is regulated by the law of God; for religion *includes* morality, and may be considered as the comprehensive moral code both of believers and unbelievers; which latter, if they had their will, would establish, many of them, too narrow and exclusive a system. These persons, in our House of Lords, properly observe a decent silence upon common questions, where nothing militates against justice or religion; but in the contrary case, express a disapprobation, which is the more emphatic, from this rare delivery of their sentiments. It is thus that the law in Britain flows purer from its source, and its healing rills must be the less mingled with any thing noxious, because those who are best acquainted with the poisonous plants of vice, are posted where they grow, to eradicate them, instead of being forbid to ascend the stream beyond stations where a tedious process would scarcely effect a purification of its tainted waters.

To my assertion, that from this mode of reasoning

all sects may be esteemed interested in the church establishment, it may be objected, that every sect does not enjoy the privileges it confers on our clergy.\* But a similar inference may be drawn from partial representation in parliament, which I shall next consider. The metaphysical politician might form such an idea as this of the Constitution perfected. He might suppose a king, lords (including bishops) and commons, who might belong to any sect, and the latter of whom should be chosen according to a regular proportion of constituents and representative. The bishops in this case would be partly what they are now, and partly different. They would, on the one hand, be possessed of that degree of apparent power, which *British* priests now safely possess, and which, with singular and striking propriety, aims at giving effect to morality; but, on the other hand, that power would be shared so as to gratify the imaginations of the fanciful; which it is not now, any more than that which is enjoyed by the members of parliament. For, as I have observed, our constitution in church and state is to be defended upon the same rational principles, though a difference between them would be made by the theologian; whose arguments, how-

ever, do not convince persons of the church of England, and should be considered separately. Lord Bolingbroke's Dissertation on Parties is an eloquent work on the side of Opposition, which might even now seem to favour the same cause. In spite of those theoretical, unfounded statements which are the character of such works, it might be read to advantage, as well as with pleasure, at times when the constitution is *really* in danger from influence or prerogative; though the good effect it produced upon our reason, or rather conduct, would take place through the medium of our passions. Helvetius speaks of the character of the philosopher, as one deserving encouragement in a state, but I think he has not a just idea of that character. I consider Lord Bolingbroke as a brilliant, and Helvetius as an acute, *orator*, both being employed to place theories in a fascinating point of view; but I cannot acknowledge in either that Newtonian doubt which prompts the true *philosopher* to keep always parallel to practice in his schemes of public utility.

However, Lord Bolingbroke, among all his attacks of the minister at that time, and proposals for reducing the power of the crown, was too little favourable



to that separation of church and state, which is ordained by the French to take place all over the world, and of course in this obsequious Island, that he makes the following observation; "Some men there are, the pests of society. I think them, who pretend a great regard to religion in general, but who take every opportunity of declaiming publicly against that system of religion, or, at least, against that church establishment, which is received in Britain."

VII. Persons are never wanting whom the liberty of the country permits and encourages to propose alterations in the government. The fancy of some one is ever found spinning the regular cobweb of equal representation, so that if it is swept away, we perceive still

The creature's at his dirty work again.

At least, it is a *superfluous* work, rendering admiration of it very *unaccountable*; and in no case has been more so, than in that of the late unfortunate authoress of the *Rights of Woman*. The privileges she would obtain for her sex universally, are what even the French have not allowed it, when anarchy has most prevailed in their country; and she may of

course be instanced as carrying this principle to the greatest extreme. The fair sex, however, will recollect, that many of the ablest men in this country are not in circumstances to possess one main privilege she would claim, the right, namely, of electing representatives, and yet consider themselves as little degraded, and as much *truly* represented, as any persons in it. That want of a just distinction between the abuse of a system, which is decried, and that system itself, though constantly perceived in the theories of modern innovators, is no where, I believe, so striking as in this book. It exhibits an occasional force of reason, with a general judgment proportionably weak and defective. Surely, one ignorant of the customs of England, who were to read many reflections in it, would be inclined to suppose, that the women of this country, instead of leading lives to the full as rational as the men, had so lost all dignity of character, that they might possibly be used as dolls, to be dressed for the amusement of children. Any great superiority of the male sex is by no means obstinately maintained. The minds of women and of men differ rather in quality than in quantity of powers. The natural inferiority of the former in

strength of frame and constitution may not have consisted with that continuity of exertion, that power of abstraction, and that hardness of character, which enable us to project great works in literature, to form systems of philosophy, and to be equal to the perpetual harassing calls of various business. The want of a certain pliability of temper, and certain graces of mind and imagination peculiar to the fair sex, must render men less fit for the attainment of particular ends, and for giving the utmost attractions to some sorts of composition, and to society. Both discover sufficient intuitive judgment, and occasional resolution, to fill the throne with glory; sufficient application to business, to be materially useful in the ordinary affairs of life, and a sufficient capacity for elegant studies, and the careless effusions of fancy, to become, in the highest degree, ornaments of the species. To some part of every human pursuit, they appear alike equal; nature having designed them to be each other's helpmates and companions; and their delicacy seems to point out that share to belong to them, which is most consistent with quiet, as it shews the exercises proper for them, are such as are marked rather by agility than strength or labour.

Mrs. Wollstonecraft denies even the quality of modesty to be more peculiarly the character of her sex than ours. A rational case is not to be objected to; but, though there are exceptions to all rules, yet our minds are not so governed by prescription, as she seems to suppose, in prejudice against immodesty in the female sex. Their voice and features must ever remain a contrast naturally revolting to a boisterous forward comportment; and were her wishes realized; were women to be seen screaming declamation in a legislative assembly, or climbing the hustings, with features distorted by party spirit, we should be reminded of the beautiful countenance, and snaky ringlets of a Medusa. Her school, which would prepare them for these unnatural employments, by educating boys and girls together, might be but little admired for the masculine sentiments it inspired equally into both. Perhaps a possessor of the talent of caricature might see their quarrels in a ridiculous point of view, and wickedly represent a pugilistic combat between some hero and heroine, as sufficiently descriptive of the *costumi* of the seminary. But where so much is required to be done, to obtain so small a progress in knowledge or happiness,

surely the projected alterations must hardly be deemed worth while.

VIII. The very usual complaint of the partial diffusion of knowledge is hardly reconcileable to the professed and apparent views of those who make it. If their true object be not to bring back that ignorance which formerly brutalized the earth, I would recommend quite an opposite plan to what they propose for the enlargement of the human mind, and recall to their recollection that since Bacon's time wise men, really favourable to the increase of knowledge, have for that very reason been the more cautious and fearful of the doctrines of those who pretended to that knowledge. Such too as deposit within the mind a moderate portion at once, in order to acquire gradual consistency, will render it a receptacle of much more, than such as by a ponderous ill-directed mass force it immediately off its balance. These remarks are applicable at the present time both to the educated and uneducated part of society.

As to the first, the frequent discussion of important questions has been recommended. I confess myself desirous of the utmost encouragement of the

philosopher speculating in his closet, within rational bounds, for the instruction of the world. I have looked with reverence towards the sacred chamber over the entrance at Trinity College,

Where NEWTON sate and thought.

But I own, from disputations on articles of faith and similar topics at meals, or on slight occasions, I see nothing more naturally to be expected, than either spleen, vanity, ~~darkness~~, or impiety. I know not by what strained analogy, or forced inference, it is, that by their means the mind can be perceived progressive rather than retrograde? Perhaps, because *the king of beasts* lashes himself into fury with his tail, therefore *the lord of the creation* can talk himself into wisdom over his cups? We may consider discussion as the smoke of science, troublesome often, when it is not made to cheer, by its perfume, the quiet symposium of friendship; but much more than troublesome, when it takes the nature of that which has of late been spreading; at such a time it equally chokes and poisons. The variegated wing of soaring genius, and the snowy plumes of virtue have frequently been unable to carry them through the loathsome mephitic va-

pour. In the formidable region where its eruptions have been witnessed, and it has reached them, they have been too lately brought down from their "pride of place," and beheld palpitating and agonizing on the ground.

As to the second, the lower orders of society, we may remark a difference in the mode of communicating and receiving knowledge; for it is not from a *series* of confounding arguments that the mischief here arises; but from the result of those arguments in deceitful propositions, which, as they affirm generally, suggest whatever simple ideas the framer chooses to excite, for his own purposes. Such truisms kindle the imaginations of the ignorant, unobstructed by the intervention of time or thought; to do which effectually, it is only desired that habits of receiving information from books should be encouraged among the labouring poor. But if it be true, that in an opulent country, trades and employments are naturally kept more distinct and separate, there will appear, to the most liberal, a reason, why in this country the poorer sort would prudently and properly be disinclined to the cultivation of literature, though it should be otherwise in newer countries. Besides, in such a coun-

plicated system, more confusion would be occasioned by a trifling disarrangement. I wish, however, the poor themselves to answer, as I think they often would, any person who should ridicule them as ignorant, and strive to shame them into a loss of time by reading. They might say, "However we want learning, yet we do not want sense to do our duty as well as you; and therefore we benefit from your studies, in what is of most concern, as much as you do: for we are guided by you, rather because you know and can tell us what is right, than because you do it. You wish us the enjoyments of literature, as you call them. — Health, a good conscience, our interests, and our families, which you begin now to pay attention to, are quite sufficient both to employ and to content us; while we are persuaded, that by our coveting more knowledge we shall do no good to any one. For of this we have a daily proof.—The farmers for whom we plough and reap, employ us constantly in that manner, and employ themselves constantly in overlooking their farms, and taking note of their outgoings and profits. Now, were we both to be equally employed in these two ways, the harvest would never more be plentiful; for we should find that our attempt



to do every thing, made us incapable of doing any thing well. So it must be with all other persons in the country. Were the authors and statesmen we hear of to spend half their time in managing farms, or were our masters to think and talk as much about politics or history as the cultivation of their land, we should neither be able to resist our enemies, nor would the country be so rich as to make it much worth while. For whatever exertions are made by any Englishman, we partake of the advantage and glory, as his countrymen, no less than you. We are all embarked in the same bottom. When we leave our work to pay a short visit to some friend in town, and there see the monuments of good Englishmen in Westminster Abbey, we feel the right we have to boast of them, whatever they excelled in. It naturally gives us pleasure to contemplate the features of the brave officers who have fallen to keep our country independent, and of course preserve our Constitution. You may perhaps consider us as not having a common interest with the rich, in the advantages of the Constitution; but we know very well that Constitution is more favourable to the poor than any other form of government, and therefore that the

statesman plans, and the general fights under it, as much for their cause as his own, whatever those uncandid people say; who cannot, like us, be just to all men. You probably may suppose, that because we are no scholars, we have no reason to admire those scholars whose monuments we see. We cannot be ranked with them as scholars, but perhaps we are more justly ranked with them than you; for both of us equally have been persons attending to our business in different ways, and not puzzling our heads with that of others; and by these means lent a helping hand to the state, and found it was from what we, and not the political idlers did, that England was respected, and reckoned every day a greater nation."

May it not be fairly doubted, whether persons striving thus to deluge with information the minds of the lower orders of society, at all wish they should produce those fruits, which its nature is calculated to hasten, and for which they profess to cultivate them? I am neither, for forcing people at present to perplex themselves with more knowledge than they would find useful and agreeable, nor for having any bounds recommended, at some future

convenient time, to the acquisition of it. As the doctrine of the Rights of Man, according to the modern interpretation of the term, was a few years ago approved of and admired, though it is now despised and execrated by the poorest peasant in the land; so all the dangerous doctrines which may be broached by demagogues, though they would be alarming at present, yet if they are guarded against till improved habits and experience prepare mankind to see the fallacy of the arguments on which they are founded, will then cease to be objects of apprehension to the good citizen. A boundless flood of knowledge may, in that remote situation, regularly be relied upon, to brood over every mind, and to ripen every harvest of human excellence.

IX. A very humorous dialogue might perhaps be written between a *citizen* of this country, going to fraternize with some French prisoners, where he could have access to any, and some one of them who had been forced to serve in the present war, by a requisition, contrary to his principles. They might both begin with ardent declamations against war in general, and its dreadful evils. By and by,

when the catalogue of them had been gone through, and not only confirmed them in their opinions, but prompted them to vent their indignation against the persons they ascribed them to, the grand discovery might be made. Both having joined to execrate the political enemies of each, without knowing them, some inconsistency might produce an explanation; and the following conversation pass:—"I do not understand you; we agreed, I think, that the British Ministry were the authors of these calamities." "No; I said it was the French Directory?" "The French Directory! what, are you an Aristocrat?" "Yes, to be sure; and you are, are you not?" "Who, I? you know the Aristocrats are fond of war?" "No; it is the Democrats, you know, who are fond of war."—Thus would these enthusiasts perceive, at length, the folly of dealing in generals, and like *Œdipus*, tremble at the destiny to which they had devoted themselves for their own actions.

But it is not by the philanthropic maxims of a solitary individual, but by the gradual progress of the civilized world, in philosophy and political economy, impressing them with an idea of their interest

in honourable peace, that the spirit of war can ever be desirably abated. I do not, with some, think we should *vote* war perpetual; nor do I give up all hopes of witnessing an approach to such an improvement as I have hinted: but neither can I distinctly see how, while human passions act as little under control, as they at present do; we should lay aside its shield, however we are loath to draw its sword. The peaceful readiness to oppose aggression, is worth more than all the triumphs of valour; and that state of things, of the two, where the former exists alone, by much the most desirable and truly glorious. But a certain *balance of principles*, by which every system is kept vigorous, and its corruptions obviated, ought, in this case, equally to be preserved. It seems as if piety would suggest this distinction between the great Cause of all, and the immediate and visible ones of what we see; that the pure intelligence of the former characteristically acts according to its all-sufficiency, and without seeming at war with itself; but the improvident energy of the latter requires some auxiliary principle of opposition to urge different forces in an intermediate direction. Man, therefore, endowed

with a consciousness of his own weakness, ought, in pious humility, as well as right reason, to adhere to this order of things. He sees that the universe is upheld by the principles of action and re-action; and that there are opposite virtues and vices, which, by the tendency of our nature to the pursuit of happiness, prevent each other's corruptions, or check each other's excesses. He sees too that practicable liberty in states is approved of by all wise men: though it diffuses power among many persons, endeavouring to govern each according to his own fallible rule of right. Why then, if he is so tender of the independence of individuals, should he be careless of that of states, which are composed of millions of those very individuals; especially as, if one nation overpowers the rest, there is no redress to be had on earth, as there is when the members of a single community are enslaved? Why should he prefer the principle of destruction to that of preservation? or why wish one form of government to be violently established all over the world, with a contemptuous disregard of the lights of wise persons attached to different ones; and not rather, with a spirit of true liberty and toleration, permit

Monarchy and Republicanism to juggle against each other, till a lasting splendour issues from their collision? for demonstrative science rises clear and beautiful, as from the waves, amidst the temperate conflicts of human opinion, and tends to harmonize earth, air, and sea, and all that they contain, with her fascinating assuasive glance.

I must own, that as often as I have reflected upon the system of universal philanthropy, and citizenship of the world, imagined by the French philosophers, so often have I concluded that, with the exception of its noxious principles, it was no other than the old fashioned system of the balance of power; and that in forming it with the precise character it now has, they built Chalcedon with the shore of Byzantium before their eyes. The most glorious time for England was that of William III. in this respect, that he may be considered not as "a man sent for from Holland,"\* to govern us, but as one deputed by the whole human race to support the republic of Europe, by directing against the countries in rebellion to it, the force of one of which he was not a native. Alfred, in laying the

\* "Rights of Man.

foundations of our government, and in forming our fleet, though the first of men, was a mere precursor to King William, whose example we have till now judged it politic to follow. To persevere in this conduct must be ever our greatest praise. The proudest emperor, who wishes well to the government and navy of England, where their power is no greater, may unreasonably be entitled an enemy of liberty, and the most democratic enthusiast, wishing their destruction, is a slave at heart. Where liberty is really prized, it will not be hazarded by being put under the protection of a single nation. This is not liberty in the old style. Milton would not have entrusted the sacred deposite to those among whom,

To overcome in battle, and subdue  
Nations, and *bring home spoils with infinite*  
*Manslaughter*, shall be held the highest pitch  
Of triumph; to be styled *great* conquerors,  
*Patrons of mankind.*————

Destroyers, rightlier call'd, and plagues of men :



or who

Rob and spoil, burn, slaughter, and enslave  
*Peactable nations, neighbouring or remote.*

————— *Who leave behind*

*Nothing but ruin, wheresoe'er they rove,  
 And all the flourishing works of peace destroy;  
 Then swell with pride, and must be titled gods,  
 Great benefactors of mankind, deliverers.*

Without approving of Milton's political principles, I am persuaded he cannot be looked upon as favourable to a scheme of enslaving the world by metaphysics, though he has been enlisted by a sort of French requisition, on the side of the French, in the present contest.

Thus the rivalry of the two nations may not be pronounced either so unreasonable or so unchristian, as has been supposed. To me there appears something wrong in our being ready to acknowledge that, for purposes of public utility, the different parts of our government should check and balance each other, and become objects of jea-

lousy to different ranks in the state, and yet not bearing to hear a syllable of any thing but union of sentiments between our country and a foreign one. Surely we ought not to shew less good will to those with whom we are more connected! Nay, if we hold the slightest rivalry between nations illiberal, can we be sincere in wishing the different orders within any to balance each other? can we be sincere in praising the British Constitution? On this subject, the parties of the most opposite views would thus reason; one might say,—“ We would by no means hurt the feelings of citizens of the Great Nation by incautious language; nor, though they perpetually threaten our destruction in the most opprobrious and contemptuous terms, can we approve of its transpiring, and being, with every preparation made known to them, that if they invade us, we shall be ever found with arms in our hands. The very idea of the thing should be suggested to them as little as possible, that we may escape the formidable frown of Republicans, for encouraging that system of rivalry which puts nations upon a par with each other. But we deprecate the slightest suspicion of a want of the new philanthropy, by

which it may be proved reconcilable to propriety and justice, that one nation should hector and domineer, and the rest court every insult from it. Our delight is to confine our praises to the Great Nation, hitherto called our rival, and to confine our ridicule and contempt to our own; which we think clearly manifests a love of peace. In proof of this we feel an ardent ambition to be corrected by so admired a hand; as self-examination teaches us, that we are of the nature of old clothes, out of which it is advisable to beat the dirt, which has for a series of years so wrought into the nap, that it is otherwise impossible for persons of perfect fashion to endure them." The other might be represented as saying,—“ We know the difference between Christian humility, and fanatic love of humiliation. Meekness is shewn by nothing more than *submitting* to the rules of duty, which forbid us, from apprehension of danger, to let injustice triumph. We preserve our secret opinion, whatever the public authoritative one of people in general, that, not only our navy, but our army have reason to hold up their heads at the present juncture; and that French Republicans in the field are not more than

a match for Britons living under a mixed government. We therefore disdain to think and speak more of the menaces of our enemies, than must be expected from the vigilance of persons awake to a sense of duty. Enough, for purposes of honest persuasion, have Englishmen been now reminded of the danger of their wives and daughters, which the children of Europe meditate the possession of, as if they were those of other Europeans; in the same manner as many a child hopes for some impossible reward of good behaviour. The boasters of their earth will find it difficult to scale our heaven. Nature has rendered their country productive of vain fictions; and ours is precisely that which she has best furnished with *clouds* to offer to their embraces."

At this time the generous prejudice discernible in such a statement of our situation, would certainly be approved of. I am one who thought it, if possible, still more praiseworthy some years ago, and who see little hope for Europe, if not only the persons in power, but every man among the lower orders in every country, for a moment fail to consider national independence, and some security in governments, as its support, the very first political

objects. For a long period of time has the enemy now been striving to employ us in speculations on internal, that we might be unprepared against her attacks upon external, liberty. This scheme, it is to be hoped, has now proved abortive, through a noble opposition made to it by us, when the state of opinion was so favourable to its success, that it must otherwise have rivetted on us slavery and disorganization; and when men of great abilities missed an opportunity of gloriously demonstrating their secret wish to preserve the ancient consequence of their country. For history discovers on how little, *in spite of human foresight*, the fate of nations depends; and I shall ever regret the impression which might have been made on the public mind, when at least the *language* of disaffection was the most heard, had persons of opposite parties set an awful example to posterity of uniting specifically for the purpose of protecting national liberty. Afterwards the complete monopoly of foreign favour and influence by one of the two most powerful nations, was adverse to rational equality; and ought to have been considered, as I hope it will be in future times, another signal not only for general union, but for guarding

against the natural weakness of alliances, by convincing the lower orders of their true interest and glory. Perhaps, indeed, when the power arising from commerce and population shall be diffused among more nations, a balance of dignity may be maintained with less care and fewer sacrifices; and on this account, I consider patriotic the share an ancestor of mine had in the work of colonization; for in sending away hands to the different quarters of the globe, who, by labouring the soil at home, might have filled our pockets, we have, on the other hand, extended to those parts that civil society, and knowledge of European polity which may, some time or other, prevent our spirit and independence from running to waste. Till, however, such powerful influence is there established for the benefit of mankind, it would be well for those countries to favour the predominancy of no Great Nation. The most desirable thing for less advanced countries would be, to have no party very zealous for the interests of any; but if it has one, it might be extremely requisite to have another equally zealous for the interests of its rivals; for the absolute power of neither is of moment to them, but their relative power ought constantly to be acknowledged

and represented greater even than their own opulence.

America has the good sense now to discredit the professions of moderation made by a people which, in making them, increased their territory by conquest beyond former example; and lest any enthusiast should boast of their leaving states nominally free, as the effect of their specious principles, most evidently, proved it was not necessary subjugation should be avowed, to deserve its name, and be followed by all its miserable and degrading consequences. America has the merit of having forgotten former causes of complaint for the sake of a noble object, worthy of a free spirit, to which all meaner considerations should be sacrificed by all; and seems thus to have said.—“ May it not be in the common course of things that a separation from the mother-country has been marked by violence and injury?—The eagle, it is known, forces from her nest, and perhaps wounds, her young, when they are fully fledged; but it is by these means they afterwards learn their strength, and find themselves able to join their parent in her attacks not only on the sheep, but the dragons.”

As I am one of those whose property lies on both sides of the vast Atlantic, I feel that appearing so much a citizen of the world (one, I mean, of the old school), I am, with great propriety, endeavouring to assist the cause of national independence. In our worst times during the present war, and when there was the greatest danger of French influence in this country, and of course over the greatest part of the world, it was natural to consider how this free character could be preserved, and I was convinced by the poet Lucan of the propriety of being upon our guard against that attachment to present habits of life, which induces us to remain in our country, or within its reach, after it has been enslaved. The folly of this line of conduct, I think, should be considered the moral of the eighth book of the *Pharsalia*.

When Pompey there is deliberating, after his defeat, on the place to which he should fly from Cæsar, and mentions his desire of going to the remote Parthians, where he might nourish a useful spirit of resistance to the schemes of ambition, Lentulus, in a plausible oration, uses such arguments as might now be used to retain persons, vanquished and



reformed by France within the scope of her power, drawn from the shadow of liberty, or some attractive points of resemblance in the situation of the two countries. He asks him whether he would be an alarmist, after so slight a check as his defeat in the pitched battle of Pharsalia,

*Siccine Thessalicæ mentem fregere ruinæ?*

*Una dies mundi damnavit fata?—*

Must the whole world, our laws and country, yield  
To one unlucky day, one ill-fought field? ROWE.

and why, professing to support liberty, he would fly to an immense distance to exist a moment under a despotic prince:

—————*Quid transfuga mundi*

*Terrarum totos tractus, cœlumque perosus,*

*Adversosque polos, alienaque sidera quæris,*

*Chaldeos culture focos, et barbara sacra*

*Parthorum famulus? quid causa obtenditur armis*

*Libertatis amor? Miserum quid decipis orbem,*

*Si servire potes?—*

Wilt thou before Chaldean altars bend?

Worship their fires, and on their kings depend?

Why didst thou draw the world to arms around?

Why cheat mankind with liberty's sweet sound?

Why on Emathia's plain fierce Cæsar brave,  
When thou canst yield thyself a tyrant's slave ?

Rowe.

He insinuates that it was wrong to forget old offences, in order to defend the liberty of the world :

———— Patimurque pudoris  
Hoc vulnus, clades ut Parthia vindicet ante  
Hesperias, quam Roma, suas ?——

Shall Parthia (shall it to our shame be known)  
Revenge Rome's wrongs, ere Rome revenge her own ?

Rowe.

and he asks, why he is so ignorant of the art of governing, as not rather to contend alone, than form alliances with despotic states ; and not to see the danger of employing foreign troops on any emergency whatever, and letting them land on Roman ground.

civilibus armis  
Elegit te nempe ducem. Quid vulnera nostra  
In Scythicos sparges populos, cladesque latentes ?  
Quid Parthos transire doces ?——

Our war no interfering kings demands,  
Nor shall be trusted to barbarian hands !

Why would'st thou bid our foestransgress their bound,  
And teach their feet to tread Hesperian ground?

ROWE.

He also informs them, it is quite a different thing  
whether they are enslaved by a king or a citizen:

————— Solatia tanti

Perdit Roma mali, nullos admittere reges,  
Sed civi servire suo. —————

Among ourselves our bonds we will deplore,  
And Rome shall serve the rebel son she bore.

ROWE.

And finally, he drops a sentiment marked by modern philanthropy; in a wish that he would fraternize with Cæsar, and carry war and destruction into ancient capitals, to guard the growing territory, and propagate the beneficent principles of Rome. This, he says, would even make him wish success to the Citizen-general, who had preached the duty of insurrection in opposing the *Aristocratic* senate.

incurrere cuncti

Debuerant in Bactra duces, et, ne qua vacarent  
Arma, vel arcetum Dacis, Rhenique catervas  
Imperii nudare latus, dum perfida tusa,  
In tumulos prolapsa ducum, Babylonque jaceret.

Assyriæ paci fînem, Fortuna, precamur :  
 Et si Thessaliâ, bellum civile peractum est,  
 Ad Parthos, qui vicit, eat. Gens unica mundi est,  
 De quâ Cæsareis possim gaudere triumphis.

With how much greater glory might you join,  
 To drive the Daci, or to free the Rhine?  
 How well your conquering legions might you lead  
 'Gainst the fierce Bactrians, and the haughty Mede?  
*Level proud Babylon's aspiring domes,*  
*And with their spoils enrich our slaughter'd leader's*  
*tombs?*

No longer, Fortune, let our friendship last,  
 Our peace, ill-omen'd, with the barbarous East;  
 If civil strife with Cæsar's conquest end,  
*To Asia let his prosperous arms extend:*  
 Eternal wars there let the victor wage,  
 And on proud Parthia pour the Roman rage.  
 There I, there all, his victories may bless,  
 And Rome herself make vows for his success.

Rowe.

The senators who, like him, are deluded, by the abstract term Liberty, into a mistake of its meaning, prefer his opinion to Pompey's; who goes in consequence to Egypt instead of Parthia. ~~Then~~ notion of liberty and its interest is then brought to the proof. The rulers of Egypt being held by no stronger tie than gratitude, Pompey, having ceased

to be an object of fear, is instantly put to death by a selfish minister, in the hope of gratifying Cæsar. The liberty enjoyed after this event by the civilized world was despotic government, and among its sovereigns were Tiberius, Caligula, Nero, Domitian, and Caracalla.

The poet from whom I have been quoting to make these remarks, has been mentioned with praise by the British Cicero, in his political writings. I do not indeed wonder that Mr. Burke found something congenial in him; for if he is the poet of liberty, he is also the poet of old institutions; having written to deplore the destruction of a government which had lasted nearly as many centuries as our own. Indeed, if we examine the principles of those who, in different ages, have been reputed friends of liberty, we shall discover a wide difference between them. In the most polished ages of Greece and Rome, the cause of liberty was purely defensive, without a thought of reform and innovation in its champions, unless Cataline and his companions are allowed such. On the other hand, in the barbarous days of Tarquin and the elder Brutus, and among the barbarous coadjutors of Cromwell and Robespierre, perpetual vindictive discontent

prevailed, at the unavoidable remains of long established usages; an eternal line of separation therefore ought to be drawn between these dissimilar periods, which ought never to be coupled in the harangues of the demagogue, however desirous he be that they should shine with a borrowed light. That sort of liberty which has been connected with virtue and literary glory, is not at all what bears that appellation now-a-days. In the present contest, France has resembled a caricature of England in the time of Cromwell, and England a faithful portrait of Greece and Rome during the battles of Marathon and Pharsalia.

France is acknowledged to be following the steps of Rome in her career of aggrandizement. The resemblance between Athens and England is pointed out by Montesquieu, a Frenchman; and if we consider both of them as possessing superior fame in literature, and the sovereignty of the seas, and allow for the effect of time in improving government, we may see reason to be pleased with the comparison. Taking it for granted Athens ~~would have had~~ a better government, had she flourished in these days, we may venture to propose her, generally, as an object of imitation: at least we may wish that our

reputation should not arise from extensive dominion, from insulting the spirited, or from mocking the timid with clemency; but from exhibiting, at one time, an extraordinary number of virtues and talents, and thus deserving rather the gratitude than the envy of mankind. But how to preserve this blameless glory safe from the encroachments of ambition, is the difficulty; as we know the weakness of an Achæan league. It is fortunate that there is one resource, which has not been yet proved insufficient to supply us with the means; and therefore we ought diligently to turn our attention to it. *The press* puts us in a different situation from the Greeks and Carthaginians, and leaves us the hope that by a readier means of communicating our sentiments to our fellow-citizens, we may inspire persons of all ranks with such an enlightened, effectual love of independence, that it will be impossible to delude and take them by surprise: or else, if it should unfortunately prove otherwise, and successful war give to any nation the power of commanding, or influencing ~~the rest~~, it may not boast an unanswered *Livy*: but by the diffusion of knowledge, historians and poets in all the quarters of the globe may find ~~an audience~~, and do full justice in after ages to the

generous efforts of heroes distinguished by ~~deeds~~  
more honourable than victories.

In a country where persons who have enlisted as soldiers merely to guard their property, can offer themselves to be employed out of it, as the Militia of Buckinghamshire, and other counties have lately done, proof is afforded (and in a matter of such consequence we ought not to be satisfied with the best founded presumption) that it will not shrink from the support of this great cause. The general language will not be, "because we object to becoming a province of France, we will unite against the French, if they once land in England, but will admire and encourage them on every other condition;" which is like saying to a highwayman, who sees you armed, "I will not fire, if you are contented with my money, and do not insist upon my watch." All this I know very well; and I know that the sentiments I have expressed, especially conveyed as they are, in the language of ardour, may be seen in a light where they falsely appear at variance with the spirit of Christianity. ~~I am not~~, however, likely to regret either having entertained or declared them. Many persons, I doubt not, will do me the justice to acknowledge, that super-



stupid lethargy is not religious humility ; and that powerful motives of patriotic conduct are seldom so abundant in countries, that their governments can, at all times, afford to part with any, because they are inconsistent with the moral opinions of a few in the community.

The spirit of liberty, therefore, which young men bring into the world from school and college, is praiseworthy ; but they mistake its proper object. Though it seems destined to preserve an equilibrium in the great republic of Europe, they are too apt to let their efforts dwindle into something like the struggles of aldermen, and members of corporations, who have some local privilege to contend for. It seems as if their theatre of action was too extensive, and they shrunk from the task of playing their difficult part. They, therefore, assist the cunning enemies of their country ; who, in return for the service done them unknowingly, flatter them as being Catos and Brutuses, instead of Antonys and Dolabellas ; which characters, even with incorrect intentions, they bring themselves to resemble. But the task they have to perform is of a most dignified kind. It is for them, by remaining ever in their posts, as champions of the balance

of power, to enable opposite systems (when what deserves the name exists,) to promote each other's advantages, and destroy each other's corruptions; and it is for them likewise, by protecting the smallest states of Christendom, and of the world, from injuries, meditated by the greater, to preserve to every individual on earth the respect he, as a man, must ever be entitled to. Let us rejoice that the eyes of the majority are now open to these truths, and that the hope of destroying national liberty, as it were by a blow, is possibly now for ever put an end to. Yet, as the contrary too is possible, let us form a true judgment of our danger, and be persuaded, that the idea of subjection to France, whatever government she has, is equally to be abhorred; but that Jacobinism, as a means of producing it, is infinitely more to be dreaded and opposed, than the fair and regular exertions of all her present, past, ~~and~~ future generals and statesmen put together.

X. Concerning the weight of ~~taxes~~ the usual and natural remark, to silence the clamour of discontent, is, that it will not be found such as to prevent the rapid improvement of the country, nor to

induce our manufacturers to remove their capital from it, in such number, as to render them at all regretted by those who remain behind; but that a wealthy cultivated country, like ours, which is in debt, may be more productive of comfort to its inhabitants, than a poor and barren one, which is ever so little burdened with taxes.

XI. The discouragements of agriculture complained of, are chiefly the preservation of old customs; some of which are every day partially ceasing to prevail, as the wisdom of the legislature, and interests of private persons direct. Should any great progress in agriculture be made by the enemy, there can, I think, be little doubt, that perceiving our advantage, we shall seek it, and rival him in doing what the wild adventurous spirit of revolution may have shewn practicable; nor will those, I dare say, whose interests may seem to stand in the way of a change, want the spirit necessary for it, if ever it is recommended, not by declamation, but argument.

XII. Restrictions of trade by various old laws which it is found inexpedient to repeal, but little argues

an unenlightened government, adverse to the freedom of trade. They, by no means, prevent our supposing those great talents at the head of affairs, which are naturally ambitious of the extension of commercial liberty, as a flattering proof, wherever it is practicable, of enlarged views and transcendant capacity; but permit us to rest satisfied, that whatever can be done, is secretly doing, to improve the condition of mankind. If we turn our attention to that nation which most encourages our declamations on liberty of trade, as a necessary consequence of the destruction of our ancient laws and government, we shall find it so far from setting us an example of what it recommends, that to the present day history can furnish no instance of commercial tyranny equal to that which it is at this moment exercising in Europe.

XIII. The distresses, too, of the poor will scarcely be supposed less in France, and the countries it has revolutionized, than our own; where an increase of wages has made the lower fall as easy as the middling ranks. It is only to be regretted that ocular demonstration of this fact is unattainable, for the

purpose of bringing those to confess, who affect to doubt it. However, something very near it was, beyond expectation, afforded us, in the increased comfort the Dutch prisoners affirmed they had enjoyed since their first arrival in this country. As the care of the poor has, within these few years, formed a new walk for talents and patriotism, it is to be supposed, that, in case of a peace, the magistrates will not fail, by means of themselves or others, to glean what information may be found on the Continent, or elsewhere, that can in any degree interest them.

XIV. It is universally acknowledged by all who are decently attached to the Constitution, that the *weight of the minister* is absolutely indispensable as a means of conducting the government. Here then the principle of influence is allowed, and the only difference of opinion between the members on both sides in parliament is relative to its degree. Both of them profess to think, that on the one hand there ought to be an effect experienced from this principle, so powerful, that the caprices of imprudent men should not endanger the state; and, on

the other, that the public money should not be squandered by the employment of more people than are necessary to carry on the government justly. All must agree, that where no more than this is done, placemen and pensioners act from motives as pure and faultless as other persons; and by no means as such set a bad example; though the more striking examples they set be of a different nature from those of the independent politician; and though they balance their merits by different virtues. It is always to be presumed, that if their adherence to ministers be not of use to give energy to a system upon the whole good, or if any measure really unconstitutional be proposed, that they will prefer their honour to their interest, and vote against them, as is often done. In short, this part of the community may be compared to *English* paper money, and the independent part to the precious metals, which have not any more intrinsic value than the other, though, to vulgar eyes, they appear preferable. Both, however, are of use in different ways. Sometimes it is ~~inadvisable~~ to increase the quantity of paper, and sometimes that of gold. There the comparison holds good, the ob-

just being to preserve a due balance in both cases. Sometimes, too, a culpable timidity or suspicion withdraws the gold from circulation, and the support of that system which gives value to paper, as prejudiced persons having the character of independence often throw themselves weakly into Opposition, loading the servants of Government with unjust censure, and rendering them unpopular in the country by virulent and declamatory harangues. There must, indeed, always subsist some difference of opinion between the opposite parties, on the proper degree of influence; and, kept within proper bounds, it will call forth the talents of men of eloquence, and become honourable to the country. For I am convinced of the use, not only of argumentative and energetic eloquence, but of wit and happy ridicule, in striking out truth. The former is a somewhat superior quality, but the latter is not to be contemned, and is well worthy of the possessor of the other; nor can I think it more calculated to deceive. Both of the qualities may equally do harm or good, according to the integrity of their possessors. But one certain advantage is derived from them. What is to be re-

gretted in discussion, is, that it tends to the formation of opinions upon a partial view of things. Within legal bounds, therefore, the more ideas can be suggested upon the subject of consideration, the less likelihood there is of coming to a false conclusion. Wit and eloquence, by exciting a new train of them in the mind, set the question which is agitated, in quite a different point of view, whether employed at the bar, or in the senate. Another advantage in their encouragement, experienced likewise in that of all other powers of the mind, is, that not only men are benevolently saved a painful struggle with their natures, but the will of the Deity is piously respected, who could not have intended their endowments should become useless to themselves and to the world.

In what degree the artillery of Opposition ought to be felt to produce good effects, is impossible to say precisely: and for the same reason it is wonderful that people speak so constantly of the existence of the utmost undue corruption. Nothing is easier than, by turning to the ~~Court~~ ~~Kalendar~~, to persuade a weak man that he is surrounded by the most flagrant instances of it; for he judges by the



number of names there, and does not reflect on the extremely small progress mankind have hitherto made in the science of government, and the consequent uncertainty of political justice ; more especially in a rich commercial country, like that of England. If some of the wisest and best men in it do not perceive any excess of constitutional influence, we should naturally wait for clear proof of it, before we adopt such measures as would endanger the present order of things. We should examine, for instance, whether Englishmen are a more enervated race than they were formerly ; whether literature is not far more discouraged by fashionable prejudices, than by Government ; whether essentially, in spite of some recent acts of parliament, justified by the danger that occasioned them, or rather, indeed, by their means, there is not just that degree of energy allowed to the efforts of Opposition, which is recommended by the spirit of the Constitution : and, lastly, we should consider whether an alteration has not taken place of late years, and whether, in a neighbouring country, in the present year, a heavier charge of bribery and corruption has not been made good against *the majesty of the people*, than was

ever brought forward against any English monarch. I cannot help thinking, that should the public be led to believe, that the system of government persevered in since Sir Robert Walpole's times, so clearly described in Mr. Coxe's Memoirs of that minister, ought to be changed, it would condemn itself to such a labour as the web of Penelope, in the prosecution of so very disheartening a scheme. It would be like returning to the bottom of a hill, which we had half ascended, in the hope of finding wings to reach the summit more expeditiously. This disappointment would arise from our confounding the ideas of change and improvement; whereas, if we encouraged solid judgment peaceably to strike out new plans of policy, and even permitted opposite parties (for men are made for their principles, as long as they confine them within just bounds), to produce truth by the collision of their respective opinions, we might gradually perfect the Constitution, in always availing ourselves of our experience till the present hour, instead of annihilating all traces of any that might be serviceable. Every person, therefore, ought to be convinced, that whenever the weight of the minister is demonstrated too considerable, it will undergo a

denunciation, and every orator ought to be reminded of the difference between declaiming against an existing system of government, and the defects of that system, or corruption in general.

The glory Great Britain has attained since Lord Bolingbroke's false prognostications of its downfall, and the increased reputation of Sir Robert Walpole, in spite of his not being wholly free from blame, as a minister, justify this reasoning. As to the latter, it seems very doubtful whether the splendid abilities of the great characters opposed to him, rendered them even equally fit with him for the government of the country. As a nephew of one of them, Earl Granville, (at that time Lord Carteret,) I should naturally be inclined to prefer him in that view ; yet I am ready to acknowledge the government of a free country required more patience, and greater deference to the prejudices of the people than it was likely he should display. In spite of an unruffled temper, I believe a very ardent mind rendered him far more unequal to the task of political prudence than Sir ~~Robert~~ Walpole, though his attainments were far superior, and his eloquence of a higher order. For it is not always that first rate eloquence is

united with that considerate caution, which renders equally successful the most dissimilar exertions of a minister.

XV. A distinction is evidently to be made between the love of ancient and of established systems. One of them has relation to the past, the other to the present. One of them is the effect of imagination, and a proof of good taste or warm affections, being useful as an accessory; the other results from the love of rational ease, and indicates benevolence regulated by steady judgment, being requisite as a principal.

\* This nobleman, however, while he was the first scholar of his age, amply deserved being compared, as a statesman, to Cardinal Richelieu. In one respect, I believe, he was much his superior. His disposition "void of gall," as Lord Orford's verses describe it, would not have allowed him to set any literary society on discouraging the dramatic efforts of Corneille; and, indeed, he always manifested a great regard for industrious literati. If he could be said to have practised tricks of state, it was in the most candid and open way. He appeared playing at the game of ambition for his amusement, and holding that the first pleasure was to win, and the second to lose.

The person who possesses the former, contemplates with enthusiasm the origin of institutions, and the circumstances that have relation to them, as well as the names of men whose actions have tended to their modification or melioration. Such historical events as were conducive to our present political advantages, in his eyes cast an important glory round them. He judges in the same manner of families. Those, for instance, the hopes of which are at present the representatives of our country, are far more respected by him, the one, on account of a former glorious co-operation with the great defender of European liberty against the encroachments of France; and the other, of services to the state, as well as perhaps a concentration of English genius, immortalized by poetry, in an admired retreat.\* He will not simply consider the merits of the living, while he reflects that the patriotic Duke, who is the head of one, with peculiar family consistency exerts himself to punish the aggressions of our ancient enemy; and that the gallant Marquis, who is the head of the other, acts as worthily of his ancestors, by not only, like them, serving his coun-

try, with the usual abilities of a statesman and soldier, but by leaving the beaten track in the capacity of a Lord-lieutenant, and with Atlantic force sustaining the particular interests of all the individuals of a county.

The person who possesses the latter will feel a strong repugnancy to change, considered as such ; and contemplate rather with apprehension than disgust the crude schemes of modern innovators, persevered in, in spite of their perpetual, unavoidable, and demonstrated failure.

Our history has long furnished proofs that this is neither nugatory, nor a useless distinction. Had the enthusiasm, which assisted Arthur in opposing the Saxons, prevailed in as great a degree long subsequent to that period, and prevented their establishment in the country, Alfred would not have reigned over it, and mankind would have been without the hints afforded by the English Constitution for the improvement of legislation. The love of existing was therefore happily preferred before the love of ancient systems.

During the civil wars, rendered so destructive by the rivalry of the houses of York and Lancaster, a superstitious reverence for the law of succession,

and the long established rights of princes, may have deprived the people of many opportunities of securing a state of peace and quiet, for the unmolested enjoyment of life and property. Here the love of ancient was unwisely preferred before the love of existing systems.

On the contrary, at the Restoration in 1660, the love of ancient and existing systems had but one ultimate object of *stability*, to be attained by the means of *change*. The discontent of all ranks of people at the mode of conducting government, and the miseries that were its consequence, prevented any doubt among the most sceptical, that a change would produce much addition both of quiet and happiness to the nation.

\* At the present moment, both the dispositions have the same ultimate object, yet do not unite in seeking, but in avoiding, change. The ardour and enthusiasm of the one, conspires with the steadiness and sagacity of the other, to raise, I hope, an insurmountable barrier against the attacks on the Constitution, meditated by its enemies.

In one instance, lately, we have been called upon to favour the interests of a neighbouring nation in the same manner as, in the first of these cases, we

did our own. When induced, ~~as some think,~~ by a natural love of peace, sufficient to carry the wise beyond the limits of a cold hearted prudence, the minister proposed negotiations for peace with France, we were bound, even before its government had been ratified by treaty, to dismiss all thoughts of restoring the ancient order of things, and to hope and trust that the Deity, educing good from ill, would finally enable us to hail the return of good habits, and a wise and just system of laws, in that once flourishing country. Though till then it was to be expected, that the principles of a government so unlike our own, should fail of securing our support; yet having agreed to acknowledge those principles, we could not honourably look forward to any alteration of it, founded on a departure from them: and both such as are attached to ancient and existing systems,

Fond to spread friendships, but to cover heats,  
might every day have become more willing to give  
it the fullest and the fairest trial.

That a universal love of the ~~Con~~stitution is our sheet anchor, I am thoroughly persuaded. The fashionable politicians guard against opposite ex-



tremes by preaching up the right of insurrection, and perpetual discussion on the one hand, and the restraint of laws ideally perfect on the other. What I must greatly prefer would be, a spirit of well-directed philosophical doubt, not evaporating in words, with a prudent resolution of holding fast by the Constitution and religion of our country, in order to let security second enterprise. This would be the true way of preserving a due middle course.

Those persons who think a reverence for old customs superstitious, often wonder, how it can be maintained that the world should become older, without growing wiser. But nothing could be more easily accounted for than this. Men of invention make discoveries in science, and the conclusions they arrive at are recorded, and transmitted to posterity. -- The succeeding generation is instructed in what knowledge may be derived from them; but unluckily it does not happen that in all ages the human mind is, in effect, equally tenacious of approved principles of judging. There is a lubricity in the pulp of science that eludes its grasp; an instance of which I have myself thought I observed, in comparing the state of criticism at the beginning of this century,

and the present time. Some critics consider themselves, from having read the same books, with additional experience; as more enlightened interpreters of the rules of composition than their predecessors; who admired and commended simplicity. Prepared, however, for vicious variety, by the numberless compositions which have poured in upon them from different nations, they see fancy and energy too often in the absence of good taste, which does not allow of images and ideas sufficiently palpable for them in every style of writing. Pope was, at one time, held to be rather a good versifier, than a good poet; but his superior character is now completely established. He is not the only poet who has acquired great fame after its being withheld from him. In such cases, the praise of the unwilling critics appears granted by an exception in favour of the poet, and not for those qualities for which good judges admire him. But has taste in any country regularly and constantly improved? It will hardly be asserted, that the human mind, in the reign of Alaric, appeared in any respect to more advantage, than in the reign of Alexander, many centuries before him. Mr. Burke's surmise, therefore, that more true knowledge ex-

isted in the last century than in the present, may not be thought absurd. I allow, that many discoveries have been made in modern times, though some arts are lost; but, as I have observed, the mind is not tenacious enough of just principles, when some violent prejudices are afloat. Were the understanding always kept vigorous, the progress made in science from time to time would really advance our nature. But at present, it seems often to grow relaxed, and not only for a series of years, is no increase of wisdom perceived in a country, by the useful employment of reason; but as “fancy wakes to imitate her,” all the dangerous actions and absurd discourse are exhibited, which usually are without her, either in sleep or otherwise. It is much to be wished, that the philosophers would *cease to encourage science*; for otherwise there may be danger of our never advancing one step more in certain knowledge; the perplexity of endless discussion tending immediately to prevent us. The number of abstract terms it gives birth to, and the passions and prejudices it excites, are an endless source of error. I have allowed, at the same time, that we may always add to our knowledge of the properties of matter,

and carry to greater perfection, certain arts; those especially which require little elevation of mind. The art of cookery, for instance, may not only be improved, but always preserved in its improved state; because relaxation is the energy by which this effect is wrought, and our pursuit is not favoured by laborious mental exertion, but the easy gratification of sense. In the inventions it leads to, our faculties, never "strained to the height, sink down and seek repair," from the sublimity of the effort. I understand this art (I will hope accompanied by some others of a more spiritual kind) is now successfully cultivated in France; and that indeed luxury in general was never more encouraged by any of its kings, than it at present is by its Directory.

If one part of the society ought to discourage science, another ought to encourage it in the same degree. Firmly attached to the Constitution, in church and state, the true Englishman would possess, as it were, a compass, with which he must become more enterprising in his pursuit of discoveries. Seeing that in fact opportunities were afforded of promoting the cause of science, beyond what would be expected in any other state of things, he would rely

upon their sufficiency, and take advantage of the established mode of education. He would do all in his power, that the talents of persons of every rank should be employed, by inviting all the children in whom they appear, into our excellent seminaries. He would thus secure their operation. In order, likewise, to favour it, and to protect genius from envy, as much as innocence was protected from genius, he would be upon the watch to prevent the mischiefs arising from a narrow spirit of system. He would rejoice to see religion and virtue truly and directly inculcated, as by distributing publications which have that tendency among the poor, or by any means generally diffusing a knowledge of the scriptural doctrines. He would dread, on the contrary, to see them imaginarily and indirectly inculcated; as by recommending some new restraint, suggested by fancy, as requisite to produce those proper restraints enjoined by morality, and thus rendering them less attractive, and more difficult to be submitted to. Taking the whole society together, the former are never productive of the latter, though they may in particular instances, where the desire of what is forbidden is not strong; in which case

people are often too ready to deny the right of others, to what there is, no chance they should want themselves. Suppose that one who has acquiesced in some opinion, condemning an innocent and ingenious pursuit, to ask himself this question, "Is not my ready agreement with this moralist, owing to his not forbidding me, any more than himself, the exercise of faculties suited to the ordinary pursuits of pleasure, interest, or ambition : and may not those who are thwarted by it have very fairly examined their minds in youth, and laboriously prepared them for being useful in the different ways which they have chosen; and for which they were the best adapted? This person then, upon finding such was the case, would hardly be conscious of having acted in a very generous manner, by putting a stop to exertions, in punishing the innocent, which tended to improve the thinking faculty, and by enlarging the views, to render the understanding sound and healthful. He would surely be mistaken in esteeming himself of the old school. Persons of that character, whatever their intentions, are cautious in forming systems, and would not assume the air and appearance of innovators. I ac-

knowledge we should esteem men in proportion to their virtue ; but we should be led by them in proportion to their wisdom, provided they are, at the moment, uninfluenced. It is only, however, when a society begins to think and speculate, that the dissimilar evils of religious and irreligious enthusiasm creep in. How distant was Alfred's idea of piety from that of setting bounds to the efforts of ingenuity, or the hard earned fame it sought ! He promoted the most learned and ingenious to high dignities in the church. He is spoken of as encouraging architecture, and all the elegant arts, to the utmost of his power ; at the same time that, from his early succession to the throne, he never failed to set a salutary example of domestic virtue. He did not check the natural progress of the mind by always saying to it, " thus far shalt thou go, and no farther." But with the blessings of the Reformation came some evils, though not equal, yet to be regretted. Religious theories were produced by heated imaginations ; which, however, sometimes the result of unquestionable virtue, tended, by their severe and irrational character, to drive all the gay and ingenious into the profession of libertinism. In

these times, it is certainly not useless to guard against both the opposite aberrations from the direct road of truth and reason. Dr. Johnson has warned us in our complaints of an age to recollect, that there can be only one worse than all the rest; but this, it may on the present occasion be said, is *the age of Jacobinism*.

In the brilliant times of Greece, Plato's philosophy was unfavourable to the arts, from a like desire of promoting virtue. It was certainly less blameable than that which would introduce vice and irreligion; but it was more hurtful than such theories as, though disputed, interfere with no one's plans and pursuits; or else, as no theories at all. After Plato few or no poets flourished of any eminence; from whatever cause, whether such erroneous morality, or other discouragements, still, however, the lightning and thunderbolts of the Athenian orators burst through whatever clouds of false philosophy might have threatened to obstruct them.

We ought not, therefore, to deny mankind any innocent liberty, either that of virtuous self-denial or that of lawful indulgence. It is at least inconsistent with a professed love of the present Government to



do so ; for by giving scope to the various dispositions of mankind, we prevent the thought of any necessity of change, and satisfy the minds of all people of understanding and reflection. We may allow the scrupulous part of the community, especially when uninterfering, are much the most valuable ; and their conduct, far from denoting weak prejudice, is, it must be confessed, not only the best but the wisest ; their example of moderation in pleasure having just that effect, in the present state of society, which censoriousness falsely pretends to have. But we must acknowledge likewise that if the God of nature has blessed mankind with the means of rendering that conduct easier, by harmless gratifications and employments, it is piety to forward his end. The fault of the present age is, that it praises or condemns *by inference* ; and not by previously ascertaining the object of its praise or condemnation. This may result from the universal study of moral and political philosophy, and not confining their lucubrations to those minds which are more adapted to them, than others equally powerful, but less considerate and circumspect. Hence there who object to *reform* are supposed adverse to *improvement* ; which makes altera

tions one by one, in the common course of things, without unthinkingly sounding the trumpet of rebellion. Hence, too, by some wealth, rank, and power, and by others, ingenuity and ardour in our pursuits, are held to be allied to vice and impiety. Yet on this point, I may observe, that a diligence in our calling is recommended by the Christian religion; and therefore to maintain that it indicates a want of due seriousness, because it prevents our being constantly, whether with sincerity or otherwise, putting up our prayers in the market-place, is what we are not justified in doing. As, in the different departments of a manufactory, every set of people employed upon the same part of any work, seem to have nothing else in their minds but the completion of such particular part; yet by that very confinement of attention, behaving in a sober and orderly way, sooner produce the whole in a finished state, than if they were to be always thinking and disputing about the whole, and neglect the parts; so a truly religious person, knowing there are times and seasons for all things, will, with the ease and alacrity inspired by a good conscience, give his whole mind to any business which he has in hand, during those

hours which are unoccupied by religious duties, and be sensible that his time, as it has been most profitably employed, so ought to appear to the world, in reality, all of a piece, however varied.

It is natural to expect, that an invariable attachment to the form of our government, and a determination, when threatened, to strengthen it, may be perceived not only to denote no hatred of free inquiry, but a disposition friendly to science ; as the confidence with which it inspires the genuinely speculative mind, enables it to become so fearless in the pursuit of truth, and in consequence so well calculated to benefit mankind by discoveries. Just so we enjoy the greatest quantity of liberty by the sacrifice of some portion of it. As to the spirit of true philosophical doubt and caution, which would be thus permitted, the laugh must be turned against the eloquence which attempts to ridicule it, and substitute the old exploded spirit of credulous and theoretic science. By a contrary method, by rendering an unanimous forbearance towards the constitution a bond of energetic union, and making the exception thus prove the rule, we may in time co-operate so successfully for the improvement of the species ; so

accumulate happiness, and provide such funds for the *poor in spirit* of all denominations, that we shall look back with wonder at those who now consider the metaphysical fitness of laws as the sole or principal object of human desire. We shall see them in the light of people who would madly sacrifice their end to their means, or who would maintain that a drop of water is more in quantity than the ocean. For though the man of judgment will allow the Constitution of this country to be more founded on a principle of equality than either simple monarchy or democracy, which must be biassed in favour of the rich or of the poor, yet he will perceive the equal justice that is experienced by the members of the community, does not simply result from the laws themselves, but far more from its remote consequences in the habits and opinions of men, and in the situations of every species, in which they happen to be placed.

There is no one who can pretend to be equally versed in every art and science to which his writings occasionally refer; and by hazarding no position but what he is sure tends to establish the point which he is labouring, a man deserves more honour, than

by a want of universal knowledge he can justly incur disgrace. I hope, at least I shall have manifested a competent degree of caution; but if I should not be thought, by having done so, and likewise kept aloof from system in forming some judgments, to have furnished many valuable hints on the subjects I have treated; still I may, in common with every other man, have discovered some peculiar knowledge not wholly to be contemned. Every one occupies so exclusively that precise part of the universe from which he commands the objects round him, that the rays of his intellectual vision will strike them in a somewhat new direction, and represent them to him with some peculiarity of form and appearance. He may, however, sensibly instruct by example, whatever he does by precept, if called upon by duty to be watchful of the present order of things, and animated by the great occasion, he hazards an open avowal of his unalterable attachment to the government under which he lives. Men are more upon a par in the exercise of resolution than abilities. I the less hesitate to let my conduct testify a love of my country, as I could never perceive it was inconsistent with good-will to

mankind, which is always to be discovered in universal fair dealing, and as much inclination to assist other persons in their business, of which they are probably the best judges, as is decent. • I cannot either think it right, at the most inauspicious period, to permit my imagination to be influenced in a manner prejudicial to my country, by any thing, in its present situation, capable of furnishing arguments to gloom and despondency. It may, for aught I know, be very accurately said, that flesh is grass, that empires rise and fall, that states first grow in strength, then become luxurious, and then decline; but while, with respect to past afflictions and misfortunes, I can perceive the intentions of the Deity, and acknowledge that what is, is best, I hold it the most doing superstition to deny that present danger and difficulty are benevolently given to prove our virtue by the conquest of them, rather than intended to denote the divine pleasure that we should hasten our own destruction. I would, at least, never lend a helping hand to carry from among us our true Palladium of British confidence. Far from emulating the Turks, who make no efforts to extricate themselves from any national

calamity, I shall always look for an example to those, who never despair of their country.

Should I be thought to have too little aimed at resting my arguments on religion and too much on reason; it must be recollected there may be times when we should not confine our ideas to what is merely right, but have in contemplation what is at once right and prudent. At the present time reason, or something like it, is what distempers the minds of men. Reason, therefore, according to the mode usually employed in medicine, ought to be resorted to, in order, by assimilating with, to expel it. Besides, though there is often more of what is wrong, than what is right, in plausibility, yet that can never be wholly wrong, which keeps right constantly in view. There is, therefore, I think, no just cause for regret, if this species of philosophical compost, which I have prepared, should draw forth from the venerable trunk of the Constitution some ornamental proofs of life and vigour, as long as it is still generally confessed to retain all its native characteristic beauty.

But finally, as our first object should be the establishment of rational religion, such as I under-

stand to be vital Christianity, firmly founded on reason, and then neither needlessly assailing nor assailed; I conceive it by no means improper here to ~~show~~ a remembrance of the source from whence all human blessings are derived, in expressing the sincere and ardent wish I make in the following words:—

May the Author of all good inspire the natives of the British islands, whatever part of the earth they inhabit, to cease to cherish an unnatural enmity against their country; and whether religion, politics, or private pique, alienate their mind from it, to weigh well the question, whether they could by any other means better promote their own interests, and employ themselves for the improvement of society, than by instantly so far forgetting every cause of discontent, that the sun may in the next century, first rise upon them, as subjects favouring all the upright views of their rulers! May He inspire the party which is in power to preserve as temperate a conduct as is compatible with necessary energy; to recommend opinions rather by their own truth and beneficence, than the criminality which fancy and enthusiasm undistinguishingly attach to their disbelief; and benevolently to favour every innocent



propensity of human nature ; so that a marked progress may appear made by us in morality, on a comparison of this with the ensuing century ! And may He crown all our patriotic endeavours with the ~~most~~ complete success, and perpetuate our excellent Constitution, in a perpetually improving state ; rendering it the present preservation, and future safeguard of the world !

FINIS.

*Latest Published by the same Author, in Two Volumes Octavo, Price 15s. in Boards.*

Critical, Poetical, and Dramatic Works. Vol. I. containing, Letters on the Drama; Battle of Eddington; Critical, and Poetical Miscellanies; Reply to the Monthly Reviewers. Vol. II. dedicated to the Lord Bishop of Worcester, with a Preface, the Art of English Poetry, imitated from Horace; also Samson Agonistes, Silent Woman, and the French play of Semiramis, adapted for representation.

Printed for J. Hatchard, No. 173 (opposite Burlington House), Piccadilly, of whom may be had

1. A Speculative Sketch of Europe, translated from the French of M. Duniouriez; to which are prefixed Strictures upon the chapter relative to Great Britain. Price 2s. 6d.

2. The Family Tale; or the Story of Pitt, Fox, and O'Connor. Price 1s. with a Preface and Notes.

And all new Books and Pamphlets











